Pontifícia Universidade Católica
do Rio de Janeiro

**Marina Sertã Miranda**

# **Oedipal Hobbes**: Subjecthood, Subjectivity and Neurosis in Hobbes's Social Contract

**DISSERTAÇÃO DE MESTRADO**

Dissertation presented to the Programa de Pós-Graduação em Relações Internacionais of PUC-Rio in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Mestre em Relações Internacionais.

Advisor: Prof. James Casas Klausen

Rio de Janeiro

July 2019

Pontifícia Universidade Católica
do Rio de Janeiro

**Marina Sertã Miranda**

# **Oedipal Hobbes**: Subjecthood, Subjectivity and Neurosis in Hobbes's Social Contract

Dissertation presented to the Programa de Pós-Graduação em Relações Internacionais of PUC-Rio n partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Mestre em Relações Internacionais. Approved by the Examination Committee.

**Prof. James Casas Klausen**

Advisor

Instituto de Relaçõeos Internacionais – PUC-Rio

**Paula Orrico Sandrin**

Instituto de Relações Internacionais – PUC-Rio

**Nancy Luxon**

Department of Political Science – University of Minnesota

Rio de Janeiro, July 26th, 2019

**Marina Sertã Miranda**

International Relations graduate from Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (IRI/PUC-Rio) in 2016.



Bibliographic data

Miranda, Marina Sertã

Oedipal Hobbes : subjecthood, subjectivity and neurosis in Hobbes's social contract / Marina Sertã Miranda ; advisor: James Casas Klausen. – 2019.
178 f. ; 30 cm

Dissertação (mestrado)–Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Instituto de Relações Internacionais, 2019.
Inclui bibliografia

1. Relações Internacionais – Teses. 2. Sujeito. 3. Subjetividade. 4. Teoria contratualista. 5. Teoria psicanalítica. 6. Gênero e sexualidade. I. Klausen, Jimmy Casas. II. Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro. Instituto de Relações Internacionais. III. Título.

CDD: 327

To my mom and dad: Gerson and Elisa

For encouraging me to dream big, for showing me by example the value of an education, and for inspiring me to put my knowledge to the use of my community. And, above all, for all their love and sacrifice to make my dreams come true.

## Acknowledgements

To my parents, for always providing me the emotional, financial and all other support I needed. For teaching me what love is in all its might and its most beautiful expression. You have taught me to cultivate love wherever I am, and this ability has allowed me the freedom to never walk through life alone. I love you both more than anything in my life. Thank you for everything you have ever taught me.

To my dear friends that have made my B.A. financially possible. More specifically to my dear friend Diego Herói and our dear departed Pe. Pecci. And to our distinguished vice-reitor comunitário, Augusto Sampaio and his team.

To all my friends in my hometown: Friburgo. To all the people who have stuck out through school, church and all other activities that have allowed me to gather and cultivate friendship with the most generous and loving people in all the world. For being present in all the multiple ways presence manifests itself nowadays, for tolerating my absence, and loving me nonetheless, and, specially, for letting me carry a little piece of each one of you wherever I go.

To my all the dear friends I have been able to make throughout my time in IRI, as an undergrad and as a master's student. To the ones that have been with me virtually since day one: for being my home away from home, for being my brothers and sisters here in this town. Especially Amanda Melo, Carol Grinsztajn, Felipe Alves, Franco Napoleão, Julia Zordan. Kayo Moura, Sergio Jordão, Thais Queiroz. I am forever grateful to have all of you in my life, and forever grateful that you have chosen to share yours with me. I love you all with all my heart. To the most recent, and by no means less important friends, especially the ones with whom I've shared these last two years more closely. Namely, Aline Rangel, Ana Carolina Macedo, Antonella Zugliani, Flávia Belmont, Guilherme Andrade, Luisa Fenizola, Natália Neubern, Rafael Jordan, Thais Vivacqua, Pablo Fontes, Bruna Meireles, Suzana Velasco, Maria Alice Albuquerque, Amanda Álvares, Ricardo Prata, Thais Bakker, Sebastián Henao, Beatriz Mattos, Camila Jardim, Luisa Lobato, Luisa Giannini, Victoria Santos, Gustavo Bezerra, Lucas Carames, Cristiana González, Rachel Coutinho, Fátima Mello, Vinícius Santiago, Thiago Braz, Tatiana Castelo Branco and Ananda Vilela. For the beers, and the talks, for sharing insights, frustrations, and all the ideas we have been able to share in this short, but significant time. I hope we can keep walking along this road together, building a possible future for education in Brasil.

To the sweetest and most caring partner I could ever ask for in life: Hugo. For sharing the love and the weight of this journey. For being my refuge and safe haven. For sharing life with me, in all its glorious mess. For making me laugh. For growing with me. For challenging me to think further and wider and differently. Life's a whole lot better with you.

To my dear advisor, Jimmy. For always welcoming me and my ideas into your office. For nurturing and challenging me, and helping turn those raw ideas into this beautiful piece of work which I am proud to present. For trusting me, and allowing me space to develop my own position and situating myself in the debates most important to me. For providing the vast literature – as well as recognizing I needed to stop adding literature at some point – in which I was able to immerse myself and play with all the concepts I wanted to engage with.

To Paula Sandrin, for braving through the "psychoanalytical theory" literature in IR and "politics" more broadly. But, most importantly, for the friendship we've been able to cultivate amidst these discussions. For all the warmth and kindness you have shown me, and the sharp wit you've always bring to our discussions. May we always share our lives in these most beautiful ways.

To Nancy Luxon, for taking the time to read and engage with my work. I am sure it is going to be a very productive debate. For the promptness and sweetness in all the responses. I keep being lucky enough to bump into people whose intelligence match their kindness.

To dear Rob Walker, for questioning me into realizing "the problem of subjectivity" is nowhere near marginal in IR, but the very contestation and negotiation of the limits of the "personal" and the "political". But, most of all, for always welcoming my questions and discomforts with open smiles, a tight hugs and long conversations.

To Paulo Chamon, not only my thesis advisor, but my advisor throughout most of my undergraduate degree. For showing me kindness and generosity, for teaching me what it means to truly listen. For being open, and teaching me the importance of failing. You're one of the most fundamental pieces of who I am not only academically nor intellectually, but personally and politically as well – hell, you have shown me the dangers and projects behind those very distinctions! May I someday be an insignificant part of the great teacher you have become.

To the organizers of the II Seminário da Pós-Graduação do IRI/PUC-Rio 2018. To all the colleagues that have been present and have given me the gift of weighing in my dissertation project, especially to my dear friend Bruna Holstein Meireles; and dear professor João Pontes Nogueira, for engaging with my work in depth and contributing for the blossoming of the ideas once planted as seeds.

To the ones that from early on have been responsible for my intellectual formation. To Rafael Louredo, for believing in me and all his students, for pushing me/us into this brave new world, for teaching me to *always* ask why, and, most important, to our friendship, that has lasted throughout these years. Thank you for leading me this way. And to Fernando Nunes, for the short but invaluable time our paths did cross. We made it worthwhile.

To my dearest professors Paula Drumond, Márcio Scalércio, Fernando Maia, Gloria Maria Teles, Diogo Dairo, Victor Coutinho e Andrea Gill for an exceptional education.

For not only teaching me, but allowing for the processes I could truly embody the theories we were able to dive in and discuss in class.

To my dearest professors Maíra Síman Gomes, Marta Fernandes, Beto Yamato, João Pontes Nogueira, Jimmy Casas Klausen, Isabel Siqueira, Stephano Guzzini, Paula Sandrin, Anna Leander e Carolina Moulin. I couldn't be more honored to have been able to learn from you. For all literature you have put me in contact with, for all of our discussions, but, most important, for supporting, understanding and being there for me. I have learned to walk the walk of the many many talks we have had, or at least began to try to. And it is all because of all of your beautiful examples. Thank you for giving being the kinds of professors I can someday strive to be.

To everyone at IRI and BPC, namely: Lia Gonzalez, Cris, Paty, Nena Coelho, Peterson Mello, Geísa Alcântara, Claudia Darze, Renato Nóbrega, Vinicius Kede, Dayse Rufino, Francisca, Clara Costa, Lutiene Plácido. Without each and every single one of you providing the amazing structure in which we could have classes, meetings, lectures, and everything else an academic routine involves, our whole world would crumble.

This study was financed in part by the Fundação Carlos Chagas Filho de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro – Brasil (FAPERJ)

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superio - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.

## Abstract

Miranda, Marina Sertã; Klausen, James Casas (Advisor). **Oedipal Hobbes: Subjecthood, Subjectivity and Neurosis in Hobbes's Social Contract**. Rio de Janeiro, 2019, 178p. Dissertação de Mestrado – Instituto de Relações Internacionais, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro.

This dissertation expresses and narrates my struggle to grapple with my own desire of knowing, its impossibility, and the connections between power and claims to truth in those – people and narratives – authorized by claims to know. I chose the particular process of subject formation as understood by the psychoanalytical theory developed by Jacques Lacan – in his "return to Freud" – and the social contract theory of Thomas Hobbes. This process of subject formation is one I understand, rooted in the thought of Judith Butler, as a co-constitutive and codependent relationship, where no subject can emerge unless subjected by power, and power can only exist as the effects of authorization of certain subjects. The particular path through which I have been able to do this has been through the exploration, first, of a certain structuring character language has both in lacanian psychoanalytical theory and in the hobbesian political treatise. This allowed me to take one step further into analyzing how the neurotic subject and the social contract subject emerge and understand them as one and the same. So then I could be able to follow Lacan's exploration of subject formation in the device of the Name-of-the-Father, hoping it would make me understand a particular investment of the social contract theory subject in paternal authority. I chose to close this dissertation, then, not confirming and reiterating the movement I have been able to find and develop, but with a critique of the heteronormative, phallocentric model in which much of psychoanalytical theory is rooted in, and its damaging effects on the mechanisms of exclusion and authorization of subjects in our society, as based on sexual difference. I have emerged from this dissertation not only smarter from the books I have read and literature I have engaged with, but wiser in my own inquiries and desire to have access and know "how the world works".

## Keywords

Subject; subjectivity; social contract theory; psychoanalytical theory; gender and sexuality

## Resumo

Miranda, Marina Sertã; Klausen, James Casas (Orientador). **Hobbes Édipico: Formação do Sujeito, Subjetividade e Neurose no Contrato Social de Thomas Hobbes**. Rio de Janeiro, 2019, 178p. Dissertação de Mestrado – Instituto de Relações Internacionais, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro.

A presente dissertação expressa e narra meu processo de compreensão do meu desejo de saber, suas impossibilidades, e as conexões entre poder e reivindicações à verdade nas narrativas e sujeitos autorizados por tais reivindicações. Eu escolhi particularmente o processo de formação do sujeito como compreendido pela teoria psicanalítica desenvolvida por Jacques Lacan – em seu "retorno a Freud" – e pela teoria contratualista como desenvolvida por Thomas Hobbes. Esse processo de formação do sujeito é um que eu entendo, como Judith Butler, como co-constitutivo e codependente com o poder que o forma numa relação em que não há emergência de um sujeito a não ser que autorizado por alguma instância de poder, ao mesmo tempo que não há poder senão como efeito sobre e através dos sujeitos a quem sujeita. O caminho em particular que eu consegui traçar em minha exploração, primeiro, foi entendendo um certo caráter ou papel estruturante da linguagem na teoria de ambos Lacan e Hobbes. Isso me permitiu dar um passo além, na análise de como o sujeito neurótico e o sujeito do contrato social emergem não só dos mesmos contextos, mas, sendo assim, talvez sejam um e o mesmo sujeito. Para, então, seguir o processo de formação do sujeito como colocada por Lacan até o mecanismo do Nome-do-Pai, procurando entender nossos investimentos políticos em uma certa forma paternalista de autoridade. No último e final passo deste processo ao invés de se fechar e confirmar-se a si mesma, eu busco partilhar uma crítica de um certo modelo heteronormativo e falocêntrico no qual muito da teoria psicanalítica está baseada, seus efeitos danosos nos mecanismos de exclusão e autorização de determinados sujeitos na nossa sociedade, baseados em uma diferenciação sexual. Eu emerjo desta dissertação não só mais capaz de engajar livros, autores e literaturas, mas compreendendo melhor e sendo mais atenta ao meu próprio desejo de saber e os mecanismos de exclusão vigentes no nosso mundo.

## Palavras-chave

sujeito; subjetividade; teoria contratualista; teoria psicanalítica; gênero e sexualidade.

# Sumário

In the *Greater Logic*[1], Hegel gives the example of the person who thinks that he might learn how to swim by learning what is required before entering the water. The person does not realize that one learns to swim only by entering the water and practicing one's strokes in the midst of the activity itself. Hegel implicitly likens the Kantian to one who seeks to how to swim before actually swimming, and he counters this model of a self-possessed cognition with one that gives itself over to the activity itself, from of knowing that is given over to the world it seeks to know. (…) Hegel's own persistent references to 'losing oneself' and 'giving oneself over' only confirm the point that the knowing subject cannot be understood as one who imposes ready-made categories on a pregiven world. The categories are shaped by the world it seeks to know, just as the world is not known without the prior action of those categories. (…) **We do not remain the same, and neither do our cognitive categories, as we enter into a knowing encounter with the world. Both the knowing subject and the world are undone and redone by the act of knowledge**.

Judith Butler

[1] G.W.F. Hegel. *Hegel's Science of Logic*, trans. A.V. Miller, New York: Humanities Press, 1976.

# INTRODUCTION: “All writing is prefatory”

I’d love to start with a story of how I always wanted to know how stuff works. How, when I was little, I used to take everything apart to figure out how cogs and gears came about to turn wheels, and make bits and parts, electric currents and fuels into cars, clocks, radios and all the stuff that moves our world. But my interest in the ‘how’ of stuff was different. I’d always wanted to know what that new word I had just heard meant, or why do people do the stuff they do the way they do them. So, I bothered my parents, teachers and friends with endless “whats” and “hows” and “whys”, as I tried to navigate a world I did not understand.

Later, as I grew up, I found IR as a way to deal with those questions. IR was to me, above all, a way to address my desire to somehow crack the code of ‘why do we do the things we do’, or ‘why is the world the way it is’. I got into IR hoping to learn not about foreign policy, GDPs or weapons of massive destruction, but hoping to learn ways in which I could make sense of and begin to understand the world. Why did people started killing their neighbors in Rwanda? Why did Yugoslavia fell apart after Tito died? Why do people become so invested in the idea of nation? What makes them lay down their lives for it, and be willing to kill others? Those were the mechanics I wanted to understand. And I guess that’s why theory was kind of a love at first sight to me: theory taught me ways to think. It helped me figure out what to do with the bunch of news I used to hear people talking about every day. Theory was the blueprint to the cogs and gears of how the stuff that mattered to me worked. It showed me the underlying logics of everything. It gave me the feeling I had swallowed the blue pill and somehow learned the code to the things we hold as truths and the power structures we have come to know as realities.

That is the hold theory has on me: seductive and dangerous. It gives me the satisfaction of seeing the cogs and gears of how the world works. Theory makes the mechanics and logics underlying world processes seem self-evident. It makes self-defense seem like a natural consequence of anarchy (WALTZ, 1979). It makes nations’

need to accumulate power and the various strategies they engage in order to do so – or deter others from doing so – a natural part of their struggle for survival (MEARSHEIMER, 2001). It makes the provision of public goods by a hegemon only natural for a stable and orderly international system (GILPIN, 2002; KINDLERBERGER, 1986). And that nations' expectations converge and they come together around sets of agreed upon principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures in order to reduce the costs of their transactions and increase predictability in an anarchic environment not only logical, but part of the strategies for surviving in such an environment (KRASNER, 1976). Theory makes the social construction of our world self-evident, as we navigate rules, norms and identities, whether those will be the ones making up the co-constitutive relationship between society and institutions ruling our lives, or defining the interests governing nation's wills (WENDT, 1992; ONUF, 1989; KATZENSTEIN, 1996).

But this is not how the world works. No cogs and gears, mechanics, or blueprints, no underlying logic to it all – as me or Hobbes (1983) might have hoped for. "[W]e must not imagine that the world turns towards us a legible face which we would have only to decipher" (FOCAULT, 1981, p. 67).

Even as I discovered and explored strands of theory that openly engage the deep entanglement between power, (claims to) truth and knowledge, I never seemed to abandon the desire to know. These theories opened up space – or rather, fought and forced their way into a suffocating discipline – for other stories to be told. And I learned how this whole body of knowledge I so eagerly pursued contributes to the annihilation of entire worlds and their ways to know. I learned how hierarchies were built and crystalized, in order for people of color to be dispossessed of their homes and have ownership of their lands and bodies ransacked by white men convinced they knew better (TODOROV, 2010; MOHANTY, 1984; MUPPIDI, 2012; QUIJANO, 2005). I learned how women had been excluded from the discipline of International Relations (from here on referred to as "IR") (TICKNER, 1997), how our knowledges had been demonized and either burned along with our bodies or raped into silence – usually, depending on the color of our skin (CORRÊA, 1996; STOLKE, 2006; LOPES, 2003;

PACHECO, 2008). And even as I engaged with theories that seek to investigate practices of sovereignty at the limits and its performative character, even as I found boundaries to be the place to search for power, and borders to twist back onto themselves only to find the limits of the endeavors the discipline of IR seems so involved in (WALKER, 2010, 2006; WEBER, 1995; BARTELSON, 1998), I still found myself looking for one big explanation that would tell me the reason behind all – ALL: practices of sovereignty, people's displacement, wars, nationalism, oppression, exclusion, segregation, dynamics of identity and difference, who gets to be a subject, who gets to be 'normal', who gets to live, who has to die, and which stories live on after bodies disintegrate.

I found both me and this discipline I came into being in had deep unresolved issues with our desire to know, the power that comes with being able to say "I know how the world works", and the authority built upon this supposed knowledge. In this process, I have been able to both find and build a space in between. One in which I can recognize both my desire of cracking the code and unraveling the logics and mechanics of the gears and cogs making up our world, and the power structures in which knowledge is created. I found and created spaces where resistance could be cultivated in my 'theorizing'. I learned other ways to know. I found and reconnected with sources of knowledge deemed illegitimate by the structure in which I had learned to 'know' (FOUCAULT, 2003). I told my own stories and learned to be attentive to the stories other women had to share. I gathered those stories and found they articulate the most abstract concepts I could allow myself to think of. I understood world politics from my own experience and through the eyes, ears and mouths of my attentive colleagues (ENLOE, 1996, 2004, 2014; INAYATULLAH, 2010; DAUPHINEE, 2013; BRIGG, BLEIKER, 2010). I found theory in the ways which world processes had come to manifest in my body, and embody theory on how I move in the world, the questions I asked and the things and people I paid attention to, the theories that I had come in contact with in books and discussions as an everyday practice (ZALEWSKI, 1996).

I learned to find knowledge in places other than books, and allowed by body to inhabit places other than the library, classrooms and halls of the university. I learned

how world processes involving investments in global events such as the Olympics and the FIFA World Cup are materialized in the most literal way on the ground. I've seen houses been torn down by the state. I've seen people lose their homes. I've seen communities being smashed to the ground, reduced to rubles and families torn apart by the strategies of 'divide and conquer' we in the colonized world know all too well. I've seen resistance and heard a story of my country being re-told not as a peaceful convergence of a racial democracy made up by portuguese conquerors, black slaves willing to work in the plantations and hospitable indigenous people – as our history books would have us believe – but as a history of dispossession. Of repeating cycles of uprooting indigenous people, black people, poor people, and oppressed people of all sorts. I've seen great women stand in front of giant machines – both literal giant excavators about to tear down their homes, and more figurative giant machines of state, private contractors and international organizations joining interests and profiting both out of and in spite of the destruction of peoples' lives – and defy their power. I've seen a great community stand up to the state and resist, and survive – and keep on surviving and telling their story of resistance, and weaving along networks of resistance and defiance to the state with other communities. And in this process, I've experienced theory unfolding before my eyes. I learned to have attentive ears and to take in the stories people told me, and open my eyes to find what I had been reading and discussing in the theory I found in books.

Although I have been able to find and experience theorization in those 'other' spaces, I still have great difficulty finding space for them in my everyday life. In these last two years I have buried myself in books, and have been slowly being taken away from those places I found other types of knowledge. And I know this is partially due to the comfort I find in recognizing libraries, classrooms and the halls of the university as home, and the demands of committing more fully to academic life. But I also cannot help to notice that the economy of how I spend my time and find space to seek for knowledge has more to do with the authority and legitimacy academic knowledge has been able to accumulate throughout the last few centuries. So much so that, in the moment I am faced with the scarcity of my own time and forced to make a choice, I choose the libraries, I choose the classrooms and halls, I choose seventeenth-century

political theorization to look for the foundations and blueprints of our political lives instead of the everyday practices unfolding before my eyes. But, still, I know I have not lost these 'other' ways in which I have been able to find knowledge. I know my research, the research making up this very dissertation, have been rooted and guided in my own experience with authority and the political processes happening around me. There is no such thing as academic life, personal life, and political life. They are one and the same, deeply intertwined. And I hope a lifetime of pursuing knowledge will lead me to deal with desire and frustration, with the lure of legitimacy I find in the knowledge of books and the lure of authenticity I find in the knowledge of grassroots political organization and resistance, and personal experience. I hope I will be able to find still many other places knowledge can be found. And I hope I will cultivate wisdom to navigate them all.

I found strength in cross-disciplinary efforts, but I've also learned not to seek in them the answers for the lacks in the discipline of IR. I learned I could maybe find space and start trying to make "the problem of the international" – whatever the hell that is – speak to the problem of "the unconscious" and vice versa. And I found they have more to say about each other than I could ever have imagined (WALKER, BIGO, 2007).

Asking how stuff works led me to psychanalytical theory, and I found it had the same kind of lure I found in IR Theory. Psychoanalytical Theory seemed to promised me to dive in the depths of human psyche and unravel the 'hows' of peoples' minds. It was a way for me to dig deeper into the processes IR seems to have only a superficial grasp. For my own amusement, later I found Psychoanalytical Theory, at least the one I now find myself working with, has no interest in depth, but find itself working on the surface of the chains of signifiers in which the unconscious seems to show itself through slips and cracks and unexpected turns (LACAN, 2006a; 2006b). Psychoanalytical Theory was also one of the ways – along with the literature around autobiography, storytelling and narrative in I – I found to address the issues that mattered most intimate and personally to me.

I found, as an undergraduate student, I had been reading and writing on the suffering deemed relevant by this discipline I fell in love with and found myself in – the one in wars, humanitarian crisis, displacement, genocide, … – as a way of erasing and silencing the suffering of everyday life. Or, to better put it, it seemed that I was too well reproducing the disciplinary spacing and racializing of narratives of suffering I seem to find in IR Theory. Suffering, for me, as well as for IR, was geographically and racially bound: it happened to those black and brown peoples in those god forsaken places – and it was my duty, as an enlightened young white person, to put an end to those peoples' sufferings and save them from themselves (KUMARAKULASINGAM, 2014; MAMDANI, 2002; BOLTANSKI, 2004). Suffering was not and could not ever be a part of our everyday lives. Not ours. Not as product and part of our economic and political systems. Suffering could never be one of those cogs. But that's what I found when I read IR and Psychoanalytical Theory into my own relationship with academia, and my crushing anxiety towards needing to be the absolute best in every single aspect of my academic (and personal) life: I learned pathologies such as anxiety and depression and emerge in a strictly neoliberal lexicon, and are rooted in a mix of insecurities brought by recoil of welfare policies, and the crushing weight of having work so amalgamated in our identities that every professional failure paralyzes you in metrics in which losing and winning are the only two possible outcomes, (MIRANDA, CHAMON, 2017), and where our economic system is a race for life, in which there are only so many "winning" slots and all the other "losers" get left behind to rot and die (KRAMNICK, 1981).

Reading Psychoanalytical Theory along with IR Theory – and the already existing dialogues with philosophy, sociology and so on – opens up room for me to breathe. It eases the eagerness of a young girl who once thought she could find all her answers in IR, and allows me to question the discipline, and go further into my own path in my questioning of the 'whats' 'hows' and 'whys' of the world. It opens up room for me both to face head on and to dance with – as well as to be more aware – of the place authority has in this dissertation, and in my academic/intellectual/professional/personal/political project. That I seem to always seek for bodies of theory that will give the blueprint, or the answer to it all, and yet I

always seem to find ways to question these bodies of knowledge rather than hold on to them as truths, speaks volumes to my relationship with the authority those subjects are supposed to know, and maybe to my relationship with authority in general. And here I'm proud to find myself among a rank of remarkable feminists questioning some of the assumptions in Psychoanalytical Theory as well as all the others on the margins of what seems to be critical theorization in IR. I hope to stay in and out of line enough with the discipline to be able to remember find a place to, once again, hear the "problem of the international" and the "problem of the unconscious" talk amongst themselves. (WALKER, BIGO, 2007).

Of what happens in these next few pages I can only be audience as much as author. I can only take full responsibility and know none of this work is only my own. From where I stand, everything I have and have not been able to write is inevitable. I take full responsibility for every single word, as much as I am fully aware, they are not mine to keep, and they cannot be contained. A psychoanalytical reading of Hobbes's political theory is already present in every word of every chapter, in the construction and structuring of each section; and a feminist critique of psychoanalytical theory is already interwoven in the sexed positions "father", "mother", "law" and "lack". It may not be for you. And I don't want to take the position of unraveling some sort of self-evident truth. These debates are far too rich in their positions to take just one as the absolute truth and ride with it. But to me, the discussions themselves seem inevitable. There is no place in the world for me for a theory of the subject which does not take into account how we've been racially and sexually subjected. I do not care for it. And it does not work for me. So, it seems only inevitable to take the road I'll be taking, to follow the literature I'll be following, and ask the questions I'll be asking. And the best part is that I get to do it: I get to choose, and stand and argue, and make all the mistakes these pages will be filled with, even though there's no real solid unified "I" from which to claim all of this. I get to play along these lines – to find a whole political theory standing upon the concept of the subject, only to find this subject as lacking at its very core – and try to understand a theory of the subject along with all the dead white men that have come before "I".

## 0. 1. “Here I stand; I can do no other”

And this is where I’d like to start: with “I” – as it often has to for any research to make sense to me, as self-indulgent, -centered and -absorbed as it might seem, it always starts with me. Or rather, “I”. It always starts with a single voice, thought or want transformed into will, commitment, hard work and months and months of writing to carry on the research “I” initially intended to do, to follow that gut feeling, put it in words and think it through in a more or less formal way. It always starts with “I”, a subject that wants, thinks and does. And maybe that’s why every bone in my body or fiber in my being refuses, even unconsciously, to erase “I” from the narrative, and start with universal “truths”, facts or empty statements about whatever topic I write about. I always start with “I”, always have to. Because if I do, I no longer get to pretend this is not about me, erase or distance myself from the work behind the words. Even though “I” as an author am very much dead and no true intent or meaning can be derived from my words, nor can I provide any sort of stability to any of this work. I refuse to run from “I” and the pain in addressing the anxiety of performing as a single unified voice, thought or want (CAMPBELL, 1998). I am pressing on it, and being attentive to what it has to say. I am fully aware this does not make my research any more meaningful or “authentic” (DALEY, 2013). But it does make it meaningful to me.

Starting with me, or “I” always seems to be a dangerous endeavor or a slippery slope. One mine you’re making witty remarks on how politics works in the most “micro” levels in subjects and our investments through psychic processes, and the other, you’re crying over a teddy bear you lost when you were four. These are the kind of slips I want to keep myself from having. And, foremost, I want to start off our conversation on subject formation I am trying to get started through this dissertation differentiating three categories that seem here important to me: “I”, “the subject” and “ego”. “I” write this dissertation in the first person singular: I. This is mostly how I will put myself here, and the occasional use or “we” or “our”/“ours” will be an attempt to include the reader in the conversation I am attempting to get started in these few pages,

or a reference do a disciplinary or political "we" – the first, addressed in this paragraph, the later, in a further paragraph on "the subject". Now, there's a little more involved in "I" in this dissertation, since I am putting myself and my desire to know here as object to be inquired. This sharing of my desire to know and my personal trajectory in/with the discipline is an attempt to implicate myself in the work. I do not in any way believe I am a neutral, impartial, uninvolved observer. I am not nor I intend to be an armchair philosopher. I am implicated. I know that I, as much as the next person, am involved in the psychic processes that make up our investments in authority. And I do not want to pose myself and an illuminated unaffected detached observer. Furthermore, I am a strong believer in the power of autobiography, storytelling and narrative. And, through my engagements with this subsection of IR, have been able to inquire how my desires, feeling, perceptions and thoughts are implicated in more complex networks of decision making, economical processes, deeply rooted oppressions and more.

Here, along, with Lacan (2006a), I want to differentiate "I" from "ego" – although they might translate roughly in the same word. The mid-1900's psychoanalyst and theorist stood firmly against so called "self-psychology" developing at the same he was writing time in the USA. These kinds of therapy are the ones we find in cognitive behavior psychology, coaching techniques, and so on. My main objection to this kind of thinking is that it corroborates the idea of a unified actualized autonomous self, the sort of self we might see in the Cartesian subject. As a clinical practice, I as long as I have read, it does more harm than good, forcing patients to suppress their issues and traumas marshalling in mantras of self-actualization and success. And as theory, it would be an engagement with the same sort of rational subject that we find in economic theory, that seems to lead to poor theorizations and simplistic conclusions.

Finally, for "the subject", how could I possibly narrow down this political category in one simple paragraph? "The subject" for me, here, as far as the limits of this present dissertation go, is a political category. Having said that, every one might be an individual, not everyone, though, gets to be granted the status of a subject. Subjecthood, as I understanding in the context of this dissertation is compose of basically two things: 1. recognition; and 2. self-legislation. Meaning: if you have your

humanity and autonomy recognized, you can call yourself a subject. This is relevant to my dissertation to the extent that, just as I have said before: everyone might be an individual, but not everyone gets to "subject" status. A good example for that is the right to vote. In Brasil, women didn't get the right to vote until 1932 – keep in mind that our first elections were in 1981. The 1981 Constitution excluded homeless people, women, priests or any member of a religious or military organization, people from lower income brackets and people who were not able to read. In the US, things do not look so good either, as women had been granted the right to vote only by the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment (in time for the 1920 presidential election), and racial discrimination was outlawed and african-americans were allowed to exercise their rights to vote by the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I like to use the example of voting rights not only because it has a direct implication on our current representative model of politics, but because of recognition. With struggles to access the right to vote, we can see who was perceived as "subject", "citizen" or "human" at the time the voting systems in any given country were designed. And we can see how political struggle for the right to govern our bodies, to have a say in the decision that affects our lives shape how we might perceive ourselves as worthy of said rights and, subjecthood, citizenship and humanity.

I learned to make room for my anxieties in my research, I learned to let them speak through me, and found ways to address them through the literature I found myself drawn to. I watched them converge around "subject", "subjectivity" and other similar words – each able to evoke an entire world of its own. They've led me to the problem of the emergence of the subject and international politics as categories, and they've allowed me to engage the emergence of these categories as simultaneous, codependent and unable to fit in a single linear narrative (BUTLER, 1997). More specifically, they've led me to the emergence of the subject and political entity, or authority, as political categories in the social contract as Thomas Hobbes puts it in his 1651 political treatise, Leviathan.

And here is where I believe I haven't been drawn to Hobbes's political treatise by chance. He seems to share the same desire to make sense of "stuff" as me. And the

same approach to trying understand the modern machine – some post-structural, post-colonial and feminist theory aside. Hobbes seems to share my desire to understand modern – and contemporary, as far as 'contemporary' carries with it the molds made in modernity – politics as "a watch, or some such small engine, the matter, figure, and motion of the wheeles, cannot well be known, except it be taken in sunder, and viewed in parts" (HOBBES, 1983). So, taking on the task of reading the subject in Hobbes, to me, speaks directly to the pursue of knowledge and truth and the place of authority both in me and in the discipline of IR. Reading the subject in Hobbes is only one particular instance through which the problem of subjectivity seems to manifest in IR — a particular significant one, I will try to argue, but only of numerous instances, nonetheless. Reading the subject in Hobbes seems particularly important to me for two main reasons. First, Hobbes seems to be a cornerstone upon which all IR Theory cannons stand. From the more traditional classical and structural, or neo-, realists, such as Morgenthau and Waltz, to more "cutting edge", "forward thinking" post-structuralists, like Ashley, Hobbes seems like an obsessive point to which they all eventually return, from which all legitimacy emerges, and all theory comes back to. Second, Hobbes lays out, or rather performs, a particular theory of subjectivity upon which not only all IR Theory stands, but all our political thinking. In one swift move, Hobbes was able to create not only subject, state and the rights-based legal relationship between them (MARTELL, 2007), and not only subject and state as political categories, but the subjectivity upon which our modern politics stands, the very divide between internal and external, between domestic and foreign, private and public, self and other — same reason I found Lacan to be a particularly good company in trying to find my way understanding international politics.



### 0. 1. 1. I:IR

Charlotte Epstein (2013) draws the relationship between particular models of the subject and subjectivity – or agency, as she puts it – in IR Theory, and the hobbesian legacy in the relationship between these particular ways of theorizing the subject and

the world in which it emerges as such. In her effort to Theorize Agency in Hobbes's Wake, Epstein recognizes how

"Hobbes's state of nature is traditionally considered the founding myth for the rational actor. It thus provides the starting point for examining IR's historically prior and explicitly individualist model of agency. Yet the critique of these realist and rationalist appropriations of Hobbes, while important, is not new. Hobbes's political myth is important because of what it actually tells us about the individual's makeup" (EPSTEIN, 2013, p. 289).

And in that individual makeup, Epstein points out two different models of agency the discipline of IR seems to structure its theorization around, while proposing a third one: the 'rational actor' model for mainstream theory; the 'constructivist self' for constructivist theory; and her new model, the 'split speaking subject'. Epstein's effort here speaks not only to her theorizing agency in IR Theory, but also her addressing of the hobbesian legacy IR seems so determined to erase in which

"[m]yths have played a central role in revealing collective unconscious structures and in psychoanalysis's constitution as a body of scientific knowledge. Centering my reading on the Hobbesian state of nature, I show how Hobbes and Lacan proceed down surprisingly similar paths. Strange bedfellows though they may seem at first sight, their theories illuminate one other, the former providing a narrative illustrating the relevance of Lacan's understanding of the structure of the human psyche for political analysis at large; the latter drawing out how Hobbes's formulation of the problem of political order reaches deep into the workings of the individual psyche. Hence in engaging with the Hobbesian legacy in IR my aim is to reveal the speaking subject that lies buried away in IR's founding myth, and to show how it can help to understand agency in international politics" (EPSTEIN, 2013, p. 289).

The idea here seems to be twofold: not only Epstein engages the particular models for the subject upon which each particular strand of IR Theory seems to stand on, but IR Theory's larger issue relying in particular understandings of the subject to build its theories upon, as mentioned before.

Hobbes's legacy in IR theory seems to serve the main purpose of reifying modern man as a rational, autonomous, present – in the logocentric procedure Ashley (1989) identifies as being used by Waltz (2001) between man and war –, master of history and science, capable of knowing, of recognizing progress and driving society towards it; and the international realm as its diametric/constitutive opposite: a realm of anarchy, war, darkness[2] and danger. Hobbes's 'shadow', then, extends far beyond explicit citations, as one might think to be his 'actual influence', but as laying out a category upon which all (mainstream) IR theory comes to rely on: sovereign modern man (ASHLEY, 1989; EPSTEIN, 2013). What most post-structural IR Theory seems to do, in this sense, is destabilizing and deconstructing this subject as diverse, lacking and not fully present. And Epstein's proposed 'split speaking subject' tackles precisely this understanding of the subject drawing from lacanian psychoanalysis very attempt to stand against a Cartesian subject. Bringing in Lacan's split speaking subject not as completely new model for refunding the subject, but one that has always been there, lurking in a more generous reading of Hobbes, Epstein seems to hope we might be able to switch from the bellicose, exclusory thinking, and recognize the constitutive dependence on difference in IR Theory. Epstein's argument for a new model of the subject, then, comes not as a complete refounding of (modern international) politics, but keeping its hobbesian roots, finds in them another possible way.

This is precisely what I wish to do in the next few pages that will make up this dissertation. I am neither so hopeful or ambitious as to think I can ever refound the categories of modern (international) politics or the modern subject. The task I plan on taking in the next chapters to come for me is about looking modern politics in the eye through the category of the subject – and facing modern politics as deeply rooted in and dependent on the category of the subject. It's about finding my way through a particular writing of authority in Hobbes: both the writing of authority present in the pages of Leviathan; and the authority most IR Theory still draws from Hobbes and

[2] In the western white supremacist connotation of "dark" which is a derogatory term to imply mysticism, horror or simply to express a lack of knowledge about a place or person, individual or collective, that inspires, for western man, the utmost sensation of fear.

hobbesian readings incorporated in our theorization. Indeed as James Martell points out:

> "[t]he great achievement of Leviathan is to enable its readers to catch the author in the act of producing his own textual authority and furthermore, the authority of the sovereign. Having so been exposed, the authority that is produced through rhetoric becomes as legible as the tropes and figures that produce it. What remains in the wake of such an exposure is the reader's awareness of their own role and participation in the promulgation of authority as well as the possibility that the reader will learn to employ the codes and meanings of rhetoric deliberately rather than passively, with important consequences for the types of political authority we subscribe to (and those we don't) (MARTELL, 2007, p. 38).

This is what I hope this dissertation will be able to do: allow me to explore the process of (psychic) formation or emergence of the subject as such.

Taking "I" or "the subject" as an object of study, then, is not about prioritizing micro politics over world processes, or 'the big picture', transforming IR into journalistic story-telling of everyday life, or navel-gazing into the stories of a self-absorbed, unified, univocal "I" (INAYATULLAH, 2010). Taking "the subject", or, more specifically, the emergence of "the subject" as a political category alongside "the political" or "the international" as the subject of this dissertation allows me to see the ways in which these categories might be intertwined, what kinds of practices are authorized, what kind of politics, and what differentiations between internal and external emerge from these categories (BULTER, 1997). This dissertation is not about "bringing the subject (or subjectivity) into IR". It wouldn't need to, and doesn't have to be. "The subject", "subjectivity", or simply "I", are already present and contained in IR, in a particular understanding of what we call "the international".

They are already present in the very differentiation between an inside and an outside where conscience and private thoughts lie, and a public sphere of political debate where those private thoughts should not matter (WALKER, 1993; 2016). If we want to stick to the orthodox narrative of the discipline, "the subject" or "subjectivity" are already present in one of IR's disciplinary "Big Bangs", in the stories we tell ourselves and our undergraduate students about the emergence of an international in

which cuius regio, eius religio: meaning, “whose realm, his religion”, formalizing the principle that each kingdom should have the right to its own religion, and in each of these kingdoms, the prince’s religion should be the “official religion” (DE CARVALHO; LEIRA; HOBSON, 2011). And furthermore, the idea of a secular state, in which man should keep his faith to himself and not express it or try to rule according to it in the public realm, as Bartelson (1995) argues, creates modern conscience, the differentiation of thoughts as an internal dialogue separate from what we express to the outside world.

The creation, or conception, of “I”, a subject who speaks, acts and wills is at the core of my problem here. The emergence of a self-contained subject who somehow both already contains all the requirements to subjecthood, but whose very subjecthood can only emerge precisely at the moment he is willing to limit his (previously) boundless will is what I wish to explore. This, for me, is what speaks the loudest to the emergence of the subject, or rather, the emergence of the unconscious in the subject in psychoanalytical theory. That the subject for Lacan can only emerge when he or she subjects him or him or herself to language, when he or she limits boundless desire to what might possibly be expressed, when he or she trades boundless real for what is possible in the symbolic realm. Moreover, what I wish to explore in this dissertation is the idea that both these moves work as a retroactive fiction: the lacanian real, and the hobbesian state of nature are neither factual nor historical situations in which subjects found themselves somewhere in time, only then for, respectively, to enter the symbolic realm, and sign the social contract. They are both concocted by these men – Hobbes and Lacan – as a way to explain their particular theorizing of the subject’s coming into being, and, again respectively, a political community, and the unconscious.



### 0. 1. 2. Anarchy as a Hobbesian state of nature

IR Theory – as many or all other disciplines, I would guess – stand upon foundational myths. Certain historical events, or pieces of literature, or even certain politically relevant interpretations of said historical events and pieces of literature,

make up the grounds on which we stand on to take flight in any theoretical endeavor in and at the margins of this discipline. From the Melian Dialogue (1997), to Wilson's Fourteen Points, from Hobbes's (1997) state of nature, to Kant's perpetual peace (1991), IR Theory seems to scrape philosophy's, political theory's cannons to draw its legitimacy. We seem to claim several historical events as the Big Bangs of the discipline of International Relations, as Benjamin de Carvalho, Halvard Leira and John M. Hobson point out in their history of the discipline. 1648, and the Treaties of Westphalia are the first big bang, with the creation of the idea of autonomy within the borders of each state, and 1919, with the creation of the first chair of International Relations studies on the University of Aberytswyth. Hobbes, as I have said, forms the ranks of said cannons upon which we stand and draw our legitimacy. The passage in Leviathan known for being most relevant to international politics is the end paragraph to chapter 30, in which Hobbes states that

> "[c]oncerning the offices of one sovereign to another, which are comprehended in the Law, which is commonly called the Law of Nations, I need not to say any thing in this place; because the Law of Nations, and the Law of Nature, is the same thing. And every Sovereign hath the same Right, in procuring the safety of his People, that any particular man can have in procuring *his own safety*. And the same Law, that dictate to men that have no Civil Government, what they ought to do, and what to avoid in regard of one another, dictate the same Common-wealths, that is, to the Consciences of Soveraign Princes, and Soverain Assemblies; there being no Court of Naturall Justice, but in the Conscience onely; where not Man, but God raigneth; whose Lawes, (such of them as oblige all Mankind,) in respect of the same God, as he is King of Kings, are Lawes. But of the Kingdome of God, as King of Kings, and as King also of a peculiar People, I shall speak in the rest of this discourse (HOBBES, 1997, p. 180).

Most theorist who draw from this passage seem to find in it basis for their theorization of anarchy amongst states in the international system as a hobbesian state of nature: gruesome, dark and dangerous. And so vast are the interpretations, as to have arguments for the room for cooperation being scarce, and the possibility of anything beyond self-help non-existent, and, other than draw from Hobbes to find basis for cooperation among states even in anarchy, in security communities, such as portrayed in the passage:

> "(…) in a condition of Warre, wherein every man to every man, for want of a common Power to keep the all in awe, is an Enemy, there is no man ca hope by his own strength, or wit, to defend himselfe from destruction, without the help of Confederates; where every one expects the same defence by the Confederation, that any one else does: and therefore he which declares he thinks t reason to deceive those that help him can in reason expect no other means of safety, than what can be had from his own single Power." (HOBBES, 1997, p. 81).

What I want to do here is explore the impact reading anarchy as a hobbesian state of nature has had on IR as a discipline in its many interpretations.

I want to be pay special attention to how IR Theory's reading of anarchy might have gone far beyond mere "absence of authority" and well into a hobbesian reading of anarchy as a condition or time in which "men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called Warre; and such warre, as is of every man, against every man. (…) So the nature of War, consisteth not in actual fighting, but in the know disposition thereto, during all the time there is no assurance to the contrary" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 70). And how this condition of "warre of every man against every man" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 71) – are conditions in which Hobbes describes Man without any sort of higher authority to regulate or restrict his actions, what he also calls 'state of nature' – has been extrapolated far into the condition in which state find themselves without a higher authority to constrain and impose laws onto them[3].



[3] Let's not forget that the "state of nature" – a state in which men have the right to all, turning all against all, and making life solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short – thought experiment works not only as a retroactive fiction to justify the existence of the state, but also as a way to spatialize and temporalize difference, since "It may peradventure be thought, there was never such a time, nor condition of war as this; and I believe it was never generally so, over all the world: but there are many places, where they live so now. For the savage people in many places of America, except the government of small families, the concord whereof dependeth on natural lust, have no government at all; and live at this day in that brutish manner, as I said before. Howsoever, it may be perceived what manner of life there would be, where there were no common power to fear; by the manner of life, which men that have formerly lived under a peaceful government, use to degenerate into, in a civil war." (HOBBES, 1997, p. 70). Wild, uncivilized, lawless and unable to co-exist in society, belongs – in a linear, progressive narrative– either to the past, to a time that no longer belongs to us, or to others that, by their very definition, are not us.

In the history of IR Theory, we have many attempts to explain systemic change. But none quite as groundbreaking at its time, or able to make its mark on the discipline's history as Kenneth Waltz's structural realism. Waltz's most widely read works in IR Theory are his 1959 dissertation Man, the State, and War, and his subsequent 1979 canonical work Theory of International Politics. Much of his readings of social contract theory are drawn from Rousseau, but in a few passages, we can see a certain gloom of a Hobbesian state of nature shining through. Keeping ourselves within the discussion of Hobbes's pervasiveness in IR as a discipline, we can begin to appreciate how even the most 'structuralist' of realists, Kenneth Waltz – who owes his title of structuralist mostly for writing off "Man" an unsuited or improper "level of analysis" for IR Theory – relies on the "rational actor" as a subject model to further in his theorization on the international system (EPSTEIN, 2013). What seems to be worthy of our appreciation here, to me, is that even though Waltz claims anarchy to be the cause of state's wariness to cooperate, or even their inclination to conflict, the mistrust or aggressiveness amongst them could not be a product of anarchy alone. Anarchy, being the mere absence of authority, carries with it no natural stimuli for any kind of behavior. But a quick move from Man, State and War into Theory of International Politics allows us to see, in Waltz's three principles how self-help and differentiation of capabilities not only follow directly, but indeed seem tangled in his understanding of 'anarchy'.

This seems to be the case also with Morgenthau – another one of IR Theory's most cherished cannons from classical realist theory –, who seems to take from Hobbes (as well as from Machiavelli) both "the picture of a social world which is subject to the same mechanical laws which govern physical nature and, hence, to the same iron necessity of the causal law." (MORGENTHAU, 1967, p. 18) and the idea of a 'reason of state', in which a statesman is under no obligation to obey any morals, ethics or rule of conduct as he seeks his nation's best interest. In Waltz, (2001), whose theory relies much more on Rousseau – whose 'stag hunt' came to illustrate not only in Hobbes, but on game theory across the board (HERZ, 1950; JERVIS, 1978) the impossibility of cooperating under anarchy – than on Hobbes, we can nevertheless find a trace of this compulsive return to Hobbes shared across the discipline, more specifically as he

introduces his ‘second image’ of the causes of war among states. Hobbes, in this instance, is important for explaining how a civil state remedies the enmity and distrust men find themselves in. Following his argument with some less pessimistic liberals, Waltz goes on to present liberal peace theory to paint the picture for his ‘second image’ – being the ‘third image’, arguing war among states has systemic causes the one he actually endorses. Hobbes’s voice is most often identified in realist theory, as one justifying countries’ violence – be it natural or structural – with passages from his chapter on Naturall Conditions of Mankind, as he affirms man’s equality, and equal hope of attaining their ends resulting in an “endeavor to destroy, or subdue one an other” (HOBBES, 1997, p. 69). More offensive version of realism also find legitimacy in Hobbes’s words about men pursing “farther than their security requires” (HOBBES, 1997, p. 69) as “necessary to mans conservation”, and “ought to be allowed him” (HOBBES, 1997, p. 69).

Anarchy, for Waltz, as well as many other mainstream theorists that come before and after him, appears to mean more than then mere “absence of authority”, and begins to show the Hobbesian undertones of violence and greed. And states here seem not only to be seeking to maximize their profits – as a “rational actor” would –, but to secure their survival in a world where “anarchy” carries the threats that life be “solitary, poore, nasty, brutish and short” (HOBBES, 1997, p. 70). This natural, and permanent, state of war, is one states would also find themselves, in the absence of a central authority to keep their ambitions and aggressions in check (WILLIAMS, 1996; KORAB-KARPOWICZ, 2018). Here, anarchy alone doesn’t seem to provide explanation enough to states rejection or inclination to cooperation, or their views of different capabilities amongst states as threats or assets in possible alliances. And structure alone doesn’t seem either to provide enough explanation for states’ behavior without a theory of the subject strictly tied to it. It is, then, only uncovering the hobbesian undertones in Waltz’s reading of anarchy and the weigh Hobbes puts in a thorough understanding of the subject, we can understand the unravelling of self-help as natural consequence of anarchy.

What I want to argue here is that not only much of IR as a discipline relies on a particular understanding of the subject upon which other notions can be derived – 'anarchy', as I have mentioned before, being just one of them – but also that it erases the effects this particular understanding of the subject has on the discipline of IR. That's how Waltz can claim "Man" to be an unsuited level of analysis for IR Theory while depending heavily on the very notion of "Man" – and human nature – Hobbes lays out throughout the first fourth of Leviathan to derive his understanding of the implications 'anarchy' has on states' behaviors, and then derive the second and third principles of his Theory of International Politics.

## 0. 2. Neurotic Subject

What I wish from the work I'll be doing in the following pages is to understand how the political category of the subject structures and provides the foundations upon which our political institutions and practices stand. I want to understand how different meanings drawn from this concept might allow me see different aspects of our political reality as we have come to know it.



### 0. 2. 1. The subject in hobbesian social contract theory

The work I intent to develop in this dissertation is by no means new. Carole Pateman (1988) and Charles Mills (1997) have already shown us what it looks like when we take the subject in the social contract seriously as a category upon which our political practices and institutions stand. They provide a helpful example of what that kind of research on how the subject of social contract shapes political institutions and practices – and how, in turn, only a few subjects are recognized and granted the status of subjects – might look like. As they unravel the workings of, respectively, a Sexual and a Racial Contract underlying our Social Contract, we understand how our political reality is structure by notions of masculinity and white supremacy. Pateman gets into the specificities of how even the most basic concepts sustaining our political life, such

as the division between a public and private realm derives and depends on men's ownership and access over women's bodies. This allows, as Freud (2001) puts it in his own social treatise, men to secure their sovereignty over their own families, and meet as equal sovereigns. Mills, putting white supremacy of the social contract in question, explains how in the name of 'reason', one of Kant's criteria to recognize one's subjectivity, entire nations and peoples had either their actual bodies, their means of survival or their bodies of knowledge came to be extinct as a consequence of European colonization and imperialism – and although this extermination might be traced back to these historically situated processes, its consequences are no limited to that specific period of time, as knowledges beyond and not recognized by the western scientific enterprise continue to be delegitimized. This delegitimizing of African, American and Asian knowledge enabled europeans to make their cases for the need to put these people under their tutelage so as to lead them in the path of enlightenment and development.

That Mills and Pateman not only focus on how women and people of color have been systematically excluded from attaining the status of subjects – although a thorough analysis of even only that aspect would already in itself be a huge accomplishment – but how their/our exclusion structures our political institutions and practices as patriarchal (or fraternal, as in a brotherhood of men) and racist allows me to imagine how it might be possible to carry out a research on the psychic aspect of that very subject both Mills and Pateman interrogate, the one Hobbes so carefully presents and outlines in his Social Contract. This sort of research, for me, would involve thinking about how the subject the social contract relies on is necessarily – as Mills and Pateman shows us, white and male – neurotic.

### 0. 2. 2. Neurosis

Neurosis is a particular clinical structure defined by Freud as "the result of a conflict between Ego and Id" (FREUD, 2011, p. 177. translated.) – which Lacan later reinterprets to be a conflict between subject and law –, in which Id moves as a strong instinctual impulse, and the Ego restrains this sort of unbound desire through the

mechanisms of repression. It was originally identified by Freud and taken up by Lacan, as the clinical structure which the majority of the population fall under. “The normal structure, in the sense of that which is found in the statistical majority of the population, is neurosis, and ‘mental health’ is an illusory ideal of wholeness which can never be attained because the subject is essentially split” (EVANS, 2006, p. 126). Neurosis, then, is usually thought of as “the hegemonic pathological model in psychology” (DUNKER, 2014, p. 84. translated) against which all other psychic pathologies are compared and deemed “deductible or deficient” (DUNKER, 2014, p. 83. translated). Falling under that statistical category of ‘normality’ – recognizing ‘normal’ is a concept strange to psychoanalysis –, neurosis then gives us a particularly productive framework from which we can think psychic attachments in this political category we call ‘the subject’.

Bringing in ‘neurotic’ as a light under which we can think the subject in the social contract, then, allows us to see both how our political structures only recognizes neurotic individuals as subjects – and even physically exclude psychotic individuals from society, separating them in mental institutions – but also – how neurosis structures our political relations, in this particular instance, our attachment to authority. ‘The subject’, then, becomes a particularly circumscribed category – or, at least, I hope so – filled with meaning, and in which we can recognize particular mechanism of inclusion/exclusion and how they work to both constitute this political figure and the structure in which this particular figure acts upon. The subject, then, not only assumes ‘whiteness’, ‘maleness’ and ‘neurosis’ as its predicates – and with that movement we can recognize that calls for the abandonment of ‘identity politics’ in which people fight under the predicates and particular vulnerabilities of ‘black’, ‘women’, ‘queer’, or ‘mad’, comes from those whose predicates have been thought of as the norm – but ‘action’ and ‘agency’, defining itself as the one who acts upon.

### 0. 2. 3. Neurosis in Hobbes

Here I want to examine the specific moment in Hobbes's political treatise in which the subject gives up this very 'agency'. In chapter XVI, after having carefully constructed the specific subject upon which all social and political relations are possible, starting from the subject's most basic connection to the exterior world, his Senses, on to realms of his Imagination and Trayne of Thoughts, only to build up to Speech, Reason and Discourse, "without which, there had been amongst men, neither commonwealth, nor society, nor contract, nor peace" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 20). Hobbes's subject, then, is undeniably, a speaking subject, a subject in language, in all his social and political relations, "down" to the constitution of his very self. The ability to think, and most important, to communicate his thoughts, is where agency lays on in Hobbes. Hobbes lays out the terms under which the subject gives up his agency, called 'authorship' in order to constitute the sovereign via Social Contract. Authorship and agency which the subject "signs off" and "lay down this right to all things; and be contented with so much liberty against other men, as he would allow other men against himself." (HOBBES, 1997, p. 73) in order to constitute "a common power to keep them [men] all in awe" and rid them of "that condition which is called war; and such a war, as is of every man, against every man." (HOBBES, 1997, p. 70)

This particular moment in Hobbes's political treatise speaks directly to the entry of the subject into the symbolic order in Lacan's conjectures about the unconscious and the formation of the neurotic subject in relation to the law. "[L]ay[ing] down this right to all things" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 73) is exactly what the subject must do in order to enter the symbolic order and both have his needs communicated in an intelligible manner and have his unconscious "inaugurated". And that this "inauguration" of the subject and the political community both in Hobbes and in Lacan and Freud have their foundational moment in this compromise of unbound desire, or of a right to all things in exchange for life in society, is for me significant. The subject, both as a political a psychoanalytical category, then, comes into being through, and only though, his relation to this particular authority that represents, for him, this very limit, which is represented in Hobbes by the Leviathan, and in Lacan and Freud by the figure – or the name – of the Father.

This emergence as the subject into its very conditions of subjection is one explored by Butler (1997) in her bringing in of psychoanalytical theory to the relation between subject and power as Foucault once put it. Butler' poses the question of the relation between subject and power as constitutive impossibility of precedence of either subject or structure, power or what have you, as she puts it, there is no subject without the power subjecting them, and there is no power without a subject either effected by it[4]. She takes Foucault's concept of assujetissement, which she defines as a "fundamental dependency on a discourse we never chose but that, paradoxically, initiates and sustains our agency" (BUTLER, 1997, p. 2), or rather, "the process of becoming subordinated by power as well as the process of becoming a subject" (BUTLER, 1997, p. 2), and gives a new psychoanalytical depth highlighting the ways in which this dependence on the conditions of subjection works in the subject's psyche. This might be the most important dynamic to understand in this whole dissertation. That no subject can emerged if not subjected to power, and no power can exist if not as an effect in a subject is at the very core of the processes I want to understand. And the deeply intertwined relations between subject formation and political structure as



[4] This particular instance of the relation between subject and power are particularly evident in the following passages:

"The moment we seek to determine how power produces its subject, how the subject takes in the power by which it is inaugurated, we seem to enter this tropological quandary. We cannot presume a subject who performs an internalization if the formation of the subject is in need of explanation. The figure to which we refer has not yet acquired existence and is not part of a verifiable explanation, yet our reference continues to make a certain kind of sense. The paradox of subjection implies a paradox of referentiality: namely, that we must refer to what does not yet exist." (BUTLER, 1997, p. 4), e

""The subject" is sometimes bandied about as if it were interchangeable with "the person" or "the individual." The genealogy of the subject as a critical category, however, suggests that the subject, rather than be identified strictly with the individual, ought to be designated as a linguistic category, a placeholder, a structure in formation. Individuals come to occupy the site of the subject (the subject simultaneously emerges as a "site"), and they enjoy intelligibility only to the extent that they are, as it were, first established in language. The subject is the linguistic occasion for the individual to achieve and reproduce intelligibility, the linguistic condition of its existence and agency. No individual becomes a subject without first becoming subjected or undergoing "subjectivation" (a translation of the French *assujetissement*)." (BUTLER, 1997, p. 10-11).

Judith Butler understands it – as a psychoanalytical step from Foucault's assujetissement, roughly speaking – are the very core of that dynamic.

This fundamental dependence, as she puts it, can help us understand the neurotic subject particular attachment to authority. In Totem and Taboo (2001) this seems particularly evident as Freud tells the story of a primitive horde which, being oppressed and ostracized by a violent father comes to kill him, only to find themselves in need of order so their new founded community won't succumb into chaos and bloodshed as these men fight for the women their father once keep from them. These brothers – and the fact that they are bothers is particularly significant, as Pateman (1988) shows us in her discussion around the idea of fraternity in the social contract – them recover the figure of this father as a totem – an animal with a deeper spiritual significance – and institute a taboo around incest, which force men to seek women outside their tribes.

These are only a few questions that arise when we refuse to think of our political and psychic lives separately. Freud has dabbed many times in "expanding' the psychoanalytical analysis beyond the one on one sessions in his practice such as his efforts of trying to set the grounds for a Group Psychology (2001), his remarks on Civilization and Its Discontents (2016) his contributions to issues we now come to realize weren't solely 'of his time' on his reflections later in life in Moses and Monotheism (1939). Freud himself has also warned us against the psychologization of the masses (FREUD, 2001), but I believe some relevant work can still find its place in a refuse to psychologize the international and/or to internationalize the psychic.

Here, once again, I carry with me the questions Bigo and Walker (2007) put forth in their efforts to build an International Political Sociology. As they ponder the possibility of such an effort in the discipline of IR, Bigo and Walker warn us about the lures of simply bringing in sociological concepts to 'fix' IR Theory, and urge us to, instead, have the problem of the international in debate with the problem of sociology – or, in my case, the problem of psychoanalysis in debate with the problem of the international –, so we can resist the temptations of an easy fix, and face the limits and

borders not only between nations and in our researches, but in the very discipline IR constitutes, when we define what counts as IR and what doesn't. Here, I hope to engage in the same effort exploring the limits of the subject both in social contract theory – which, as I have mentioned, seems to have a rather foundational role in IR as a discipline – and in psychoanalytical theory.

My intention here is not only to understand socio-political phenomena through psychoanalytical theory – or vice versa – or simply to point out similarities in social contract and psychoanalytical theory – although they were where my starting point for this formulations. I want to find some sort of meaning. I find that the subject that enters the symbolic and the social contract both in Lacanian and Hobbesian theory can be one and the same. So as the band of brothers who unite to murder the ruthless father and found themselves having to institute the totem to which they should all pay respect and the taboo of incest and the men who find themselves in a grim environment were life is short and brutish and find themselves uniting their will and giving up their authorship in name of a commonwealth. And the subject who has to give up both unbound desire and "the right to all things" to have their place in society. I will get into all of that in one point or another of this dissertation, depending on the level of specificity in which I'm working. But, above all, I want to find out, if these subjects really are one and the same, what kind of politics stems out of their subjection.

In this dissertation, I hope not only to question the subject in the social contract from a psychoanalytical perspective, bringing in concepts as neurosis, Oedipus and Name-of-the-Father, but also, question the limits from these analytical tools and the conditions under which they emerge. These particular concepts – neurosis, Oedipus and Name-of-the-Father – emerge in Vienna and Paris, in the late-1800's and mid-1900's, respectively, and are very much a reflection of heteronormative, patriarchal, colonial societies. With that in mind, it seems impossible to me to take these concepts naively as if they didn't belong to particularly violent and excluding discourses on people's bodies. What I hope from an engagement centered around a strong critique of the heteronormative structure of the Oedipus is that when can find out even more about the (neurotic) subject of the social contract. My hope here is that a critical engagement

with the very basis of psychoanalytical theory, with the very conceptualization of 'the problem of the unconscious', we can find out the ways in which a compulsory – and, why not, compulsive – heteronormativity in the structure around which Freud conceptualizes neurosis, and his use of the Oedipus Myth, can help us better understand the subject's compulsive addressment to the figure of the father, in the Oedipus, and to political authority, in social contract.

### 0. 3. Is the psychic International?

I am not the first to have had the "brilliant" idea of merging in some sort of way IR Theory with Psychoanalytical Theory. And I am not in the business of saying that everyone who has ever tried it before had it wrong, and I am first brilliant mind to do it. My endeavor here, joins the works of many others in having failed at the attempt to understand world politics. And I hope we keep failing again, as I was taught to pursue research as a lifetime endeavor in a beckettian fashion: try again; fail again; fail better. Judith Butler, Slavoj Žižek, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, as well as Yannis Stavrakakis are a few of the names we in IR Theory try to draw from in Philosophy and Political Theory to bridge our understanding and disciplining into a certain field of knowledge, to find meaning and think through Psychoanalytical Theory in the issues pertaining IR. I reach and try to establish some kind of dialogue with some of this literature of engagements with Psychoanalytical Theory and "the political" – however you might draw the limits; and here I can say it is at the core of this discipline I was brought into, IR, to make those kinds of inquiries – to try to engage psychoanalysis in another way as it was once attempted to with other 'psy' studies through cognitive behavior analysis. Here, I want to highlight Snider work on decision-making process (SYNDER, BRUCK, SAPIN, 2002).

But, as I said, this was not the kind of "psychic" I wanted to engage with. So, with the help of some preliminary readings of psychoanalytical theory in IR. I went to Jenny Edkins (1999), in her brilliant introduction of lacanian psychoanalysis, as she "brought the political back in" – although some might say, it never left – some of the

issues in post-structural theory around which many have claimed a certain de-politization. She faced had on the questions of what gets to be counted as political, and the depolitization technocracies are bringing as debates get down to the nitty gritty of specifics of law, programing – as we have witnessed in the Mark Zuckerberg's interrogation regarding Facebook's sharing of users' personal informations. Charlotte Epstein (2013), whose insight on the Symbolic Leviathan is the spark to have ignited the fire burning all throughout this dissertation, and whose work I stand on to make the connections throughout these pages. Andrea Zevnik, and her engagements at the ontological level of the beings involved at the process of politics, in her engagement not only with lacanian psychoanalysis and the concept of a fractured, split speaking subject, but also with Félix Guattari and Gilles Deleuze's philosophy. Jason Glynos, working on our phantasmatic investments in political discourses, bridging ideology, political economy and democracy studies. And, finally, Ty Solomon, working – as Jason Glynos – in the field of discourse analysis, bringing in psychoanalytical theory to work through the identifications and building of identity that happened around the 2001 9/11 attacks and the subsequent policies carried out in its name, i.e. the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan (2015).

There is much more being developed in this dialogue between IR Theory and Psychoanalytical Theory as we speak. So many wonderful works I see pop out every so often. So many quality engagements I get to have with my peers and professors. So much to learn and grow from each other. I feel truly lucky to insert myself in a discussion that seems to have not only momentum within IR as a discipline, but also quality in its engagements.

## 0. 4. What to expect

As I tried to imagine a viable structure in which to set up my dissertation, I stumbled once again on the aforementioned impossibility of telling a linear story about subject formation (BUTLER, 1997). Understanding subject and power as having no precedence over each other, leaves me without a place to start my narrative. So, I

decided to take this as an opportunity to honor this impossibility breaking up my analysis not in subject then structure/power, or structure/power then subject, but in degrees of specificity. I will start presenting the general problem of the emergence of the subject in tandem with its conditions of subjection, then I hope to move on to how that happens more specifically in the structure of the social contract and of neurosis, and then I hope to be able to get into the more specific consequences of subject formation under social contract/neurosis. In that third move, I hope to engage with a more specific device in lacanian subject formation: the Name-of-the-Father. And, in a fourth and final chapter, I hope to address the problems with the cisheteronormative structure[5] around which both Freud and Lacan set up their understanding of the unconscious, and present the debate around their theories carried out until this day in the voices of Judith Butler and Slavoj Žižek. I hope to advance my argument in the following ways:

On chapter one, I explore a crucial common ground – which I believe will open many other doors for dialogue – between Hobbes and Lacan. In my exploration of hobbesian political theory, I will attempt to deal with the major politico-epistemological debate of his time: the changing locus of sovereignty. In this particular chapter, I rely very much on Hobbes's account of the biblical tale of the tower of Babel as an analogy for the world in which he found himself in: a world with no common understanding on where sovereignty stood. And much of this, I believe, grounds his attempt to build a political vocabulary for modernity, and hold on so desperately to his position as a nominalist. On Lacan and Freud, I deal with a similar issue – or, rather, in their strand of psychoanalytical theory, perspective – of approaching language as the ground upon which everything stands on. From Lacan's famous adagio "the unconscious is structured like a language" to his understanding of the subject emergence as such through – and only through – the symbolic: one of the three orders through which he understands the topography of the unconscious. I find that starting

[5] That is, a structure in which people whose sex assigned at birth matches their actual sex, the sex in which they experience life is: that is the "cis" part; and people who are attracted to people presenting as a different gender – usually in a binary of female/male – that they identify as: that is the "hetero" part. And "normative" is the implementation of those behaviors as norms to which every single person must abide to.

with this fundamental and structuring role of language in these two/three authors is important not only to get a glimpse of their common ground – although Hobbes's nominalism and Lacan's structuralism might clash at some point if one wishes to explore further the role of language and linguistics in both authors – but a crucial starting point even if I was taking them separately. "Reality", for both Hobbes and Lacan, is made up of words. And our subjectivity, subjection, or subjecthood, can only be understood as we are situated and sewn into a particular linguistic, social and political fabric.

On my second chapter, I take one step further into the specifics of subject formation both in political and psychoanalytical theory. I start with the origin stories drawn from "primitive societies" and the automatic special and temporal displacement of difference in one swift move. I present Freud's recourse to Darwin's totemic tribes and his connections between totemism and neurosis, as I try to draw some connections of my own between neurosis and subjecthood. As for Hobbes, I present the narrative of the state of nature and, most importantly, its readings and uses throughout the discipline of IR. Here, I make the point that rather a specific point in space or time, or actual political, social or religious organizations, both totemism and the state of nature might be read as retroactive fictions: stories we make up to explain and maintain the status quo. In each case, the status quo might be read as the need for government or centralized authority in order to keep chaos and violence at bay, and the need to observe the taboo of incest and reverence to the totem – in whatever form it may take – to keep social order. On the second half of this chapter, I attempt to draw a parallel between the subject's emergence as such in the symbolic, and the founding moment of the signature of the social contract. I believe and try to argue for a fruitful reading of the "letting go" of a pre-symbolic real in order for the lacanian child to have access to language and sociability, making them a part of the world we live in; and Hobbes's subject giving up the "right to all things" in order for them to transfer their authority into the Leviathan and institute a central power to keep all men "in awe".

On my third chapter, I decided to take some time going over the procedure/mechanism/role of the Name-of-the-Father. The Name-of-the-Father is an

important element in lacanian psychoanalytical theory, in which the child through, first, fear of castration and, then, through "identification as rooted in love" (LACAN, 2017, p. 154) – both in relation to the father – emerges as a subject. Throughout this chapter, I try to carefully examine the main elements which seem to be a part of this process: the first moment of deep connection with the subject/baby's primary care giver – which is identified and conflated with the mother; this person's own involvement with other things in her life other than the baby; these "other things" being reduced to "the father"; the baby's investment in their mother's desire, meaning: the father; the baby's perception of the mother as a mere messenger of the "law of the Father"; the baby's fear of castration by this seemingly ominous presence: the father; and, finally, the resolution of the Oedipus complex as the father reveals himself as the one having "it" – and by "it" Lacan means the phallus (φ), and by phallus, he means the mother's desire. It seems to me particularly important to give as much attention and to carve as much room as I have for "the Name-of-the-Father" in my dissertation because of the initial discomfort from which this dissertation emerged. We, as political subjects, seem to be very much invested in paternal authority. It seems like all we want politically, instead of taking active participation in the issues that affect us locally and globally – if that distinction even holds – is to call on daddy to save us and take care of everything for us. It seemed important to me to address the central role of the father in the Oedipus complex in order to address this particular investment in paternal authority, as I try to understand it.

On my fourth chapter, I chose to bring my dissertation to a close with a critique I could not possibly restrain myself from exploring: the critique to cisheteronormativity in the Oedipus complex. As I was trying to understand lacanian subject formation, I kept bumping into these preconceived notions of family, sex, gender, masculinity, femininity, among many others I understand if not performative, at least socially contingent. I found myself in a crossroads between a debate within the field of psychoanalytical theory, and its dialogues with other disciplines, such as philosophy and political theory. This debate is held by the so called "formalists" and "historicists". Each "side" having a different approach to the positions of "mother" and "father" as well as the structure of the family, in the Oedipus complex. Formalists, as one might

guess, argue that, following Lacan's deep rooting in saussurean linguistics "father" and "mother" are as empty as signifiers can get, and their shoes might be worn by anyone who sees fit. Historicists argue for the Hegelian discussion of abstraction as exclusion of difference/particularities. They argue that, as much as we try to exclude the particulars upon which any given abstract was built, it will always leave a remainder of the original mold. And here is where I find myself in Lacan's fifth Seminar, when he explains the Three Moments of the Oedipus complex, and, by the end of his explanation, falls into a filthy commonplace of stereotypes and caricatures of homosexuality, relegating it to a place of otherness, abjection and pathologization. This othering, Judith Butler argues, becomes structural in the Oedipus complex, as the abstract tries to rid itself from the socially and historical specific processes in which sexual difference emerges. Sexual difference, in this formalist approach, is relegated to an apolitical, a historical and asocial position. This exclusion, I side with Butler as she argues, is harmful not only exclusively to the LGBT community, but for a project of radical democracy, more widely – a project which relies on an inherent openness for contestation.

# 1. “Read Thyself”: Language and Subjectivity in Hobbes and Lacan

I’ve always wanted to know how stuff works. I always looked for answers I believed would lead me to unraveling the blueprints to the dynamics underlying the world(s) we inhabit. Always felt there was a code, or some sort of logic underneath it all. Soon enough I filled “stuff”, “world” and “all” with “international”, and started to look in IR Theory for the answers I’d been craving for. As I eagerly reached for the answers, quickly they came flooding in: balance of power, regimes, organizations, speech acts, identity… It seems as though I had found all the answers. And as soon as I was led to all those answers, I was lead not only to question them, but the dynamics they contribute to and reproduce, the context in which those answers have emerged and been legitimated as “knowledge” or “truth” and, above all, the very idea of finding truth, knowing, cracking the code, or understanding some sort of logic underneath all. So, I was taught to look for questions, instead of answers. Better questions. I was led to question my place as a subject who wanted to know, to question my desire for “knowledge”, “truth”, “answers”, or whatever was that lack that manifested as a desire to know. That sort of questioning allowed me to examine the role “knowledge” and “truth” play not only in my own personal life, but in IR as a discipline in academia more broadly – whatever the boundaries between “my own personal life”, “IR” and “academia more broadly” are, if they ever existed at all –. All the while, recognizing this dissertation as an expression of the persistence of my desire to know.

The tension I intend to hold not only in this particular chapter but throughout all my dissertation is precisely the tension between my desire to know, and have access to some sort of logic underneath it all, and my discomfort with the idea that the world, all, or whatever it is I choose to call this thing that moves me in the pursue of knowledge, can ever be known – and the power that comes with putting oneself in the place of a subject who knows, and what sort of authority relies on this very claim to knowledge and truth. In order to find better questions that might address my desire to uncover some sort of code of blueprint to the world and finally know how it works, I

chose – and to choose here has to do with actual conscient choice as much as it has to do with having the luck to stumble upon, or simply being irresistibly drawn to – social contract and psychoanalytical theory, particularly Hobbes's and Freud and Lacan's iterations, respectively, of those theories.

Reading Hobbes's political treatise alongside Lacanian and Freudian psychoanalytical theory allows me to hold space for precisely this tension between my desire to have access to the very structures holding together and shaping the world, and being aware of the dangers of believing the world works according to such mechanical structures, or some intentional and intelligible design, and the power and authority that comes with claiming to know those very structures and processes (FOUCAULT, 1978).

Social contract theory carries with it the illusion of a Big Bang, or a Fiat Lux, when all our politics was created, a place to where every relation and dynamic could be traced back to, and finally understood. Engaging social contract theory – and Hobbes, more specifically, to whom we seem to owe the foundations of the discipline of IR, and to whom we keep obsessively coming back to – speaks directly to this tension between some sort of authority that comes with the claim to knowledge about the truths structuring the world we live in, and my desire to uncover these truths, and the logics and blueprints to the underlying structures behind all. Going back to Hobbes – as if we ever left him –, for me, is very much about looking for the blueprint to our modern machine. It gives the illusion of going back to where it all began, and being able to trace all the steps to where we are now today – and fix everything we messed up along the way.

Psychoanalytical theory owes nothing to social contract theory when it comes to the seductive promise of uncovering truths. As soon as I found "subject formation" – or "the subject" – to be something around maybe my whole academic life might revolve around, I quickly found my way to psychoanalytical theory as a way or promise to uncover a deeper truth, or to find the way in which subjects become subjects. I found in Foucault's "discipline" and "biopolitics" some paths to this process, but I kept wanting more, and looking for a way to go "deeper into people's minds". Since then, I

have found there is no way to go “deeper into people’s minds”, and, in fact, that it might not even be a “deeper” in people’s minds at all. It all seems to work itself out in the surface between each signifier, no deeper than the space between them. As little-moth-me orbits around Lacanian psychoanalytical theory’s flame, and its return to Freud, I keep Foucault’s subject formation in mind, and find in Judith Butler a way to work with the both of them.

So, asking the ‘hows’ and ‘whys’ of the things people said or did seemed to be more than just a something I did as a child, it turned out to be the way I’d carry out my research. With Hobbes, I learned asking what words mean to a particular person in a particular context might mean the difference between order and chaos – which seems to be the interpretation IR Theory jumps to regarding hobbesian anarchy – and the very way to unravel the authorization of a sovereign in Leviathan. In fact, as James Martell argues, “[t]he great achievement of Leviathan is to enable its readers to catch the author in the act of producing his own textual authority and, furthermore, the authority of the sovereign. Having so been exposed, the authority that is produced through rhetoric becomes as legible as the tropes and figures that produce it” (MARTELL, 2007, p. 38). With Freud and Lacan, I learned using the words I had just learned turned out to be more than just a cutsie thing I did as a child, but the way in which the very possibilities of my being were being formed, molded and even restricted, and the very way in which the world I found myself in, the possibilities available and imaginable to me in it, and my actions upon it as a subject were being delineated. Language, in lacanian psychoanalytical theory is the very thing to in-form and inform our reality: it shapes our ideas and feelings into words through which we can express them, while simultaneously filling those very words with – the illusion of – meaning. This dynamic is lacking at its very core, as our ideas, feelings and other intangible thoughts cannot be fully encompassed by words, and words are never fully able to carry out the meanings we fill them with (FINK, 1996; STAVRAKAKIS, 1999). Language seems to play that exact structuring role in Hobbes’s political theory. It seems to conjure things into being, as individuals, by the power of them signing the social contract, conjure and breathe life into a form of political authority, under which they become subjects.

Throughout this particular chapter I will attempt to address my desire to find or unravel some deep structure to how our political realities work, and its tension with the creation of some sort of "reality" and "authority" through hobbesian social contract theory and freudian and lacanian psychoanalytical theory. I will do so diving into the role language plays in both these theories.

Learning about the role language plays in Hobbes's political theory, and being attentive to how language in its many forms – reading, speech, naming, … – takes center stage in Hobbes's writing, particularly in Leviathan, means two things to me in the scope of this dissertation: 1, instead of choosing a historically situated reading of Hobbes's work in the context of seventeenth-century England's political unrest, opting for reading Hobbes in the context of the broader philosophical debate in Europe on the foundations of sovereignty, more precisely where might sovereign authority lie in a secular state-system; – which seems to automatically fall into – 2. discussing Hobbes's nominalism as an attempt to offer the world a political vocabulary onto where a new order could be structured and cultivated.

My engagement with psychoanalytical theory lays precisely on this premise that language shapes all aspects the world we inhabit, inasmuch as our access through this world is mediated by our sensible experience. Psychoanalytical theory allows me to understand how language shapes the very possibilities of our being in the world. Understanding how we emerge as subjects in language through lacanian psychoanalysis I hope can further in my understanding of the ways in which our political vocabulary shapes not only our political possibilities and realities, but our particular attachment to a kind of authority produced in that very process of subjection (BUTLER, 1997).

## 1. 1. Writing at the edge of the world

Early on, on Leviathan's chapter IV, when Hobbes is introducing to us the importance Of Speech, its origins, its uses and abuses, he evokes the biblical tale of the

tower of Babel. Now, it is neither hardly any novelty nor has it been scarcely discussed that language plays a central role on Hobbes's political theory. From Skinner to more contemporary commentators, language has always been recognized as taking center stage on Hobbes's writing. Nevertheless, I must insist in this point, and try to articulate for myself how Hobbes's political theory tries to offer the political vocabulary for a world where order and meaning seemed to be lost.

Hobbes begins arguably his most important piece on political theory with MAN, with man's Senses, his Imagination; his Speech, Reason and Science; his Discourse; his Honors, Manners, and Natural Conditions, only then to discuss man's Natural Laws or man as Persons and Authors. Hobbes begins with man's most primal connection to the world, man's window outside to any exteriority: his senses, only then to move on to the establishment of a common society of men, in plural, in COMMONWEALTH, and its specificities. Taking upon himself the task of naming, of, most literally, building the political language of man towards Commonwealth from the ground up, definition by definition, Hobbes starts not just yet from thought or language, but from man's Senses. As Hobbes does not conceive of man's thoughts independent to his connection to the world: "[t]here is no other act of mans mind, that I can remember, naturally planted in him, so, as to need no other thing, to the exercise of it, but to be born a man, and live with the use of his five Senses" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 19). He defines Senses as "[w]hich Object worketh on the Eyes, Eares, and other parts of mans body; and by diversity of working, produceth diversity of Apparences" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 11), his Imagination – "nothing but decaying sense" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 13), a trace of the object in someone's mind once it's already gone –, working his way 'up' until what he calls a Trayne of Thoughts: "the succession of one Thought to another, which is called (to distinguish it from Discourse in words) Mentall Discourse" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 16) – be it unguided, or regulated by some desire. And in doing so, Hobbes defines the terms in which both man's relation to the external world and to himself, to his own thoughts and ability to think, can happen. As mechanically and Newtonian as "when a thing lies still, unless somewhat els stirre it, it will lye still forever. (…) [Or] when a thing is in motion, it will eternally be in motion" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 12).

Language, and speech more specifically, for Hobbes, is the way through which man can transfer his thoughts into words, as well as register, recall and share them with his counterparts.

> "(…) [T]he most noble and profitable invention of all other, was that of SPEECH, consisting of Names, or Appellation, and their Connexion; whereby men register their Thoughts; recall them when they are past; and also declare them one to another for mutuall utility and conversation; without which, there had been amongst men, neither Common-wealth, nor Society, nor Contract, nor Peace, no more than amongst Lyons, Bears, and Wolves" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 20).

Language is what allows for men to form bonds and build the foundations for community. Language is what is grounds, structures and holds together society as we know it, what allows any sociability at all. Language holds such a crucial place in Hobbes's work precisely because he writes at a time when the mutual understanding on where sovereignty lies was quickly shifting, and the grounds, structures and the glue holding together medieval order was rapidly shifting before his eyes.



### 1. 1. 1. When meaning falls apart

Our story about language as a structure upon which political authority and subjectivity lies begins with a particular world order falling apart. Organizing not only politics, but all aspects of human life, medieval order put God's representatives on earth on the top or earthly hierarchy – just beneath God himself and all heavenly beings, in the overall scheme of things –, and, of course, above all other men, earthly beings and other inanimate forms. That was, of course, in a world where everyone followed the same faith and subscribed to the same authority mediating between heaven and earth. In this order,

> "signs are objects and objects are signs; our access to the world goes through the decipherment of the infinite and homogenous stratum of things and words. Language is not an arbitrary system of signs, it is part of the world; the names of things lie hidden in the things they designate. There is no fundamental difference between what is written in a book and what can be read in the examination of an object

> and through detection of its resemblances to other objects or words. Consequently, there are no distinctions between subject and object, fiction and reality, nor between reason and rhetoric" (BARTELSON, 1995, p. 145).

This is what Descartes calls mathesis universalis, the notion that all things are knowable and orderable by comparison with one another. Things were as they were in relation to one another. They existed within a particular scheme and set of things, ordered – according to God's will – in a very particular way. And this order was universal, as far as the eye could see – meaning: Europe and its colonies.

With Martin Luther's earth-shaking – or at least the part of the earth that seemed to matter then, or even now, sometimes – ninety-five theses and the movement that would follow: sixteenth-century Reformation, that whole order seemed to no longer make sense. The Reformation, while uncovering great abuses and corruption in the Catholic Church, seemed to unleash chaos upon the old continent. Religious wars and persecution unraveled all across Europe and the blood shed in the name of who gets to interpret the word of God seemed to flow like never before.

> "In the sixteenth century the traditional order had disintegrated. As a result of the split in ecclesial unity, the entire social order became unhinged. Old ties and loyalties were dissolved. High treason and the struggle for common good became interchangeable concepts, dependent on the point of view of the ascendant faction. The general anarchy led to duels, violence and murder, while the pluralization of the Ecclesia sancta fermented corruption in whatever else remained whole: families, estates, countries, nations. Thus, from the second half of the sixteenth century onwards, a problem developed with a virulence which overreached the resources of the traditional order: the need to find a solution to the intolerant, fiercely embattled and mutually persecuting Churches or religion-bound faction of the old estates, a solution that would circumvent, settle, or smother the conflict" (KOSELLECK, 1988, p. 17).

Reading Hobbes as someone trying make sense of everything that was happening around him, and find or even found a political vocabulary amongst seventeenth-century Europe's political chaos, means reading Leviathan, and particularly his chapter Of Speech and the tower Babel tale in it as descriptive of the reality he was facing.

> "The first author of Speech was God himself, that instructed Adam how to name such creatures as he presented to his sight; (…) For I do not find any thing in the Scripture, out of which, directly or by consequence can be gathered, that Adam was taught the names of all Figures, Numbers, Measures, Colours, Sounds, Fancies, Relations; much less the names of Words and Speech, as Generall, Speciall, Affirmative, Negative, Interrogative, Optative, Infinitive, all which are useful; and least of all, of Entity, Intentionality, Quiddity, and other insignificant words of the School.
>
> But all this language gotten, and augmented by Adam and his posterity, was again lost at the tower of Babel, when by the hand of God, every man was stricken for his rebellion, with an oblivion of his former language. And being hereby forced to disperse themselves into severall parts of the world, it must needs be, that the diversity of Tongues that now is, proceeded by degrees from them, in such manner, as need (the mother of all inventions) taught them; and in tract of time grew every where more copious" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 20).



This was seventeenth-century Europe: half a dozen white men claiming "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me" (John 14:6). And here I do not want to imply these men thought they themselves were God(s), but that theirs was the truthful way through which to achieve salvation. Every single one of them claimed to know. Amongst this proliferation of truths, there was no longer a stable point of reference to which to compare and make sense of things in the great scheme of things. There were multiple orders and multiple schemes where things had different places and meanings and purposes. There was no longer one truth.

At the same time, without a common language, there is no possibility of knowledge. As Hobbes reminds us, in the state of nature, there can be no knowledge of the face of the earth'. Classical knowledge must therefore confront three problems simultaneously, which are tightly linked together into one single poblématique: without language, there can be no society and no knowledge, since language is the basis of communication and representation; without society, there can be no language and no knowledge, since society is the basis agreement on representation and truth; without knowledge, there can be no language and no society, since knowledge is the basis of cognitive order and social peace. (BARTELSON, 1995, p. 148)

To put an end to the bloodshed, Europe's kings agreed to the principle of Cuius regio eius religio, which meant that each sovereign would have autonomy over the religion of the territories over which he exercised his power, and every single person living in those territories, every single one of that sovereign's subject would have to follow that faith. Here is when we can see politics and language walking side by side. With this shift on European order, authority was no longer organized according to a great chain of being, all closely linked together according to its place in the hierarchy. Authority was now contained into each autonomous space where a sovereign would exercise its power. In terms of language too, that meant that there was no longer one locus of authority from where all meaning would be derived, no order dictating the place where each and every thing shall lie.

> "Doing this, they begin by asking how a sign could be linked to what it signifies, and respond by analyzing representation, which presupposes and articulates a binary relation between the sign and what is signified. The harmonious relation between words and things are no longer guaranteed by a divine order of the world: what once started in Babel is brought to completion by the end of the sixteenth century" (BARTELSON, 1995, p. 145-146).

The proliferation of meaning which is implicated in the passage above was a, if not the, great(est) source of anxiety to Hobbes. "The harmonious relationship between words and things" being "no longer guaranteed by a divine order in the world" (BARTELSON, 1995, p. 145-146) brought panic to this man's mind as he witnessed wars being waged over one's ability to exercise authority over a given territory, its resources and people. Hobbes was mortified by this moment in which "seeing all names are imposed to signifie our conceptions; and all our affections are but conceptions; when we conceive the same things differently, we can hardly avoid different naming of them" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 25). This is the precise moment in the narrative Hobbes tries to establish in Leviathan when God stroke men with the curse of speaking different languages, and not one man could understand another. Here, Hobbes uses the tower of Babel as a representation of a moment when the ability to understand each other wasn't derived from speaking the same language, but in holding the same things as truths. What worried him most specifically was the impossibility, with a proliferation of meanings and truths, of declaring something as universally good or bad, and, hence,

being impossible to judge someone's – even one's own – actions. In a world without order each person was the compass of their own morals, and judge or their own deeds, "[f]or these words of Good, Evill, and Compatible, are ever used with relation to the person that useth them: There being nothing simply and absolutely so; nor any common Rule of Good and Evill, to be taken from the nature of objects themselves" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 32).

That is where we can locate Hobbes's eagerness to lay out definitions to every single concept he engages with throughout his entire book. In Leviathan we see Hobbes trying to ascribe and fix meanings to concepts of our political vocabulary and produce a coherent narrative for the foundation of sovereignty. "Seeing that truth consisteth in the right ordering of names in our affirmations, a man that seeketh precise truth, had need to remember what every name he uses stands for; and to place it accordingly; or else he will find himselfe entangled in words, as a bird in lime-twiggs; the more he struggles, the more belimed" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 22). Hobbes, in a single move, tries to produce political and textual authority – that at this point, might just be one and the same – and creates not only a shared political vocabulary upon which all European order could be refounded, but also a shared place from where meaning could once again emanate and be fixed: the sovereign.

> "The namegiving function of Leviathan thus logically precedes his lawgiving function, and the links between one idea and another and the simultaneous connection between a name and the object it is to designate must be silently regulated and safeguarded as the basis of cognitive order and right and reason: without this stability, taxonomic classification is impossible, and without such cognitive order based on continuity and the enumeration of objects, political orders and security itself becomes literally unintelligible in the absolutist scheme". (BARTELSON, 1995, p. 151-152).

This refounding of the European order via social contract is what they call the 'contractual solution'. In this arrangement, order is created when "repeat the divine gesture by resorting to an external event or entity, which takes on the heavy responsibility of solving them all [the problems created by the lack of a sovereign center for meaning]" (BARTELSON, 1995, p. 148). So, man in a paradoxical move in which he is simultaneously exercising and giving up his ability to create meaning, his

authority, his 'authorship', to the sovereign. With men no longer being able to derive meaning from his own authorship, the problem of the multiplicity of meanings is supposedly solved. And so, one sovereign center is created in each portion of territory governed by each sovereign; and creating a principle of equality among them, and by this mutual recognition, the respect for each of their "persons", so they won't try to convert one another's populations waging religious wars against each other.

> "The supra-sectarian legal order managed not only to pacify the individual States; if left an even stronger imprint on the relations between States. Europe's international law could be effectively only because it engendered a new sense of obligation, one that cut across the plurality of faiths. This obligation was political. In staking out a framework of international relations it was analogous to the lines of thought along which Hobbes deduced the State. Nothing but his strict separation of exterior and interior realms could make it possible to core an area of foreign policy out of the welter of religious jurisdictions – a process which against the historic background of sectarian passions amounted all but inescapably to rationalization" (KOSELLECK, 1988, p. 41).

The only problem with this 'contractual solution' is that it presupposes as fully fixed, determined and shared the meanings of the terms through which this "contract" is agreed upon. Without an agreement on meaning, we continue to but heads in linguistic chaos. Hobbes himself admits to this quandary recognizing a need for "some coërcive Power, to compell men equally to the performance of their Covenants, by the terrour of some punishment, greater than the benefit they expect by the breach of their Covenant" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 79), and before men can even discern just from unjust. Hobbes inputs the solution of this impasse to the sole purpose and desire of men to secure their own lives. Further in this chapter, when we delve into the centrality of language in Freud and Lacan, I wish to go back to this point, to discuss how these three authors resort to a retroactive fiction – Hobbes with his gruesome state of nature, and Lacan with his unbound Real – without which they could not build their theories[6].

[6] The crisis of authority I narrate in this section in one of the examples of authoritative discourse upon which the discipline of IR stands. This is the story we tell ourselves to make sense of modern subjectivity, subjecthood and authority. A different narrative is raised by Nancy Luxon, in her book *Crisis of Authority*, in which she narrates the crisis of authority in Europe's post war period, in which "[n]ot only was there not singular order to draw together law, morality, and politics, but the bodies of authoritative

## 1. 1. 2. Public and private

The important thing to me in this process is not only the emergence and rearticulation of sovereign and its deep entanglement with language, but also what this transformation means for the subject. Modern politics, in this sense, not only relocates the locus of sovereignty, but also forges a new kind of subject who can fit into the modern mold. What differentiates this model of the subject from other previously known is what is so important for me in this work, it's what binds subject, sovereignty and power together in a circular, codependent, co-constitutive relation: subjectivity, man's internal fracture into conscience and unconscious. Subjectivity is the modern solution for the subject, and subjectivity is precisely what makes the subject modern.

> "The termination of religious civil wars meant the development of vigorous sovereign authorities which would in turn proceed to solve the ecclesial problems, each in its own way. It also led to the strict formation of States on a unified plane. By virtue of absolute sovereignty, each State's interior was clearly delimited against the interiors of its neighbours. The conscience of a sovereign was absolutely free, but his jurisdiction was confined to the inner space of the State he represented" (KOSELLECK, 1988, p. 43).

Again, what we are following here is an understanding in which subject and political structure emerge simultaneously, together and entangled. Here, as I have said before, I follow Judith Butler in her foucauldian understanding of power as disciplining and authorizing subjects. This process is a two-way street because power does not unilaterally discipline and authorize anything, neither the subject is disciplined and authorized by nothing. Being "subject" a category that only exists in relation to power, and being power invisible and, in fact, inexistent except as being exercised upon or, rather, through a subject, their co-dependence is here, given.

The reason why conscience is required in modern politics is precisely because man's subjection of his authority, of his authorship in the social contract to the

knowledge that sustained these (science, literature, history0 strained against one another" (LUXON, 2013, p. 2).

sovereign. I intend to get into this specific discussion about the subject's authority and authorship, and his signing of the social contract more specifically towards the later sections of this chapter and on the next one.

> "Hobbes introduces the State as a structure in which private mentalities are deprived of their political effect. In his constitutional law, private states of mind do not apply to the laws, and the laws do not apply to the sovereign. The public interest, about which the sovereign alone has the right to decide, no longer lies in the jurisdiction of conscience. Conscience, which becomes alienated from the State, turns into private morality. 'Auctoritas, non veritas facit legem' – laws are made by authority, not by truth" (KOSELLECK, 1988, p. 30-31).

Now I wish to address more specifically the fracture that the subjection to the sovereign's will creates in the modern subject. If the faith of the sovereign must be followed, and if all truth and meaning now emanate from the sovereign, and must be accepted believed, and practiced as absolute within the boundaries over which the sovereign exercises his powers, modern subject must suppress his own beliefs, or any sort of disagreement with the truth the sovereign has declared. This creates our well known separation between a public and a private sphere. Inside his own mind, modern man has the freedom to think and believe whatever he wants, but while living in a community, he must follow to the letter the commands of his sovereign.

"Hobbes's man is fractured, split into private and public halves: his actions are totally subject to the law of the land while his mind remains free, 'in secret free'. From here on the individual is free to migrate into his state of mind without being responsible for it. In so far as conscience participated in the political world it became the controlling authority of the duty to obey. The sovereign command relieved the subject of all responsibility: 'The Law is the publique Conscience – private Consciences … are but private opinions' (Leviathan, II, 30, 31). However, if an individual presumed to a jurisdiction which the State reserved to itself, the individual had to mystify himself, lest he be called to account. The dichotomy of man into private and public spheres was intrinsic to the genesis of the mystery" (KOSELLECK, 1988, p. 37).

Here is where I find myself most at home with the kind of theory with dealt with so far in IR as a discipline. Of course, I could argue IR as a discipline speaks to the issues of authority, that the relation between sovereign and subject might be at the heart of much of the political unrest still going on in the world even today. And 'explain' the relation between the specific object of my dissertation and IR more broadly, whatever its limits are, with examples of IR understood as the study of 'stuff happening around the world'. But I've already said I want to ask about the blueprints, the codes, the cogs and the logics. I do not want just the clockwork, and definitely don't want to just ask 'what time?'. We've already establish that's equal parts good and bad, and I've already accepted the consequences that might come with such work. So, for me, asking about subjectivity speaks to the core of the kind of theorizing we do in IR, to the very division between inside and outside we deal with in each particular case. 'The international' is made up of various supposedly homogenous entities, suppressing – or at least trying to, or supposedly doing so – their private thoughts and opinions, and various subjects trying or supposedly following a sovereign law. It is no coincidence, then, that Hobbes starts with man, dedicates one fourth of his book to build 'man' from the ground up as a political subject. Modern man emerges from modern politics as much as modern politics spring from the relations between modern men. Working from the very split between private and public, between subject and sovereign, I believe, allows me both to speak to what has already been done in the discipline of IR about subjectivity and modern politics, but to maybe find out how can we ask psychoanalytical theory to dance, and see what kinds of politics might emerge from the unconscious. I imagine a discipline emerging from the same fracture in the subject has quite a lot to say about the politics that emerge from this particular subject. And, if we've already established that the relation between subject and power, structure, authority or sovereign is necessarily circular and co-dependent/co-constitutive, it might be to our advantage to join Freud and Lacan and listen to what the unconscious might throw back at us, once asked (WALKER, 1993).



## 1. 2. Split Subject

The sixteenth-century religious Reformation in Europe, as we can see, had effects far wider than religion. Being the Catholic Church one of the most powerful organization and one of the greatest land owner in Europe at the time, its politics affected the whole continent. A contestation of not only its interpretation of the holy Bible – understood as the word of God – but its mediation between heaven and earth and the subsequent founding of new churches under the christian faith – lutherans, calvinists, anglicans, and so on – unleashed a never before seen proliferation of meaning. This proliferation of meaning had political repercussions, as the Catholic Church seemed to hold, in the Great Chain of Being, all the meaning to the order in the world. The Great Chain of Being couldn't seem to make sense as a principle to provide order and fill with meaning the modern world, so, amongst chaos and misunderstanding in Europe, a new order marked by the principle of sovereign authority over one's territory – as well as the assumption of homogeneity within the boundaries of said territory –, translated as cuius regio eius religio emerged as the organizing principle of this brand new world (BARTELSON, 1995; KOSELLECK, 1988). As no politics can emerge or survive without a subject to act through, a subject fractured between the private life of this own thoughts and opinions and the public duty of having to obey to his sovereign's will emerged both as product and condition of possibility of modern politics starting to unfold and spread across the european continent.

From this fracture between public and private, through recourse to some sort of authority to fix and derive meaning, to the conditions for subject formation within a particular socio-linguistic reality, psychoanalytical theory has opened up paths through which I can make sense of the political processes involved in becoming a subject. This fracture into public and private conscience we find the modern subject emerging in is not one strange to Freud, to whom Lacan keeps coming back to question the subject as cogito, as a single thinking unit, as one who thinks therefore is. Lacan comes back to Freud's challenging of a certain cartesian understanding of the subject with the very idea – or as some say, 'discovery' – of the unconscious, the fracture of the subject who was then split into conscious and unconscious being (EDKINS, 1999).

If Hobbes understands the importance of building a political vocabulary that can serve and be useful to modern politics, and accommodate the kind of subject who can emerge from this particular understanding of politics – as well as constitute the grounds for it –, Lacan seems to be right on the same page with the need for a socio-linguistic structure through which the subject can emerge as such. Here, I find – between the hobbesian subject – who emerges right from the start as having to 'read himself' and to whom speech is so essential as to constitute the grounds for existence in society – and the lacanian subject – to whom language is the very precondition of existence, to whom language and, more than that, the socio-political fabric which language both constitutes and expresses represent not only their environment or surroundings, but the very structure through which they emerge – similarities that together build up to a little more than mere coincidence. In the first half of this chapter, I've dedicated myself to understand how Hobbes's political treatise might have emerged from a particular historico-political need to build both a political vocabulary and a particular model for the subject upon which his theory could stand, and through which modern politics could act. I've tried to understand the broader political movement in which Hobbes seems to find himself in the sixteenth and seventeenth century european debate on the locus of sovereignty in the transition from Medieval, through Renaissance, to Enlightenment-informed politics. Now I want to understand what it means for psychoanalytical theory to emerge as a subject in a particular socio-political vocabulary, and the ways in which the subject necessarily emerges in a deep entanglement in the particular linguistic reality in which they are conceived.



### 1. 2. 2. The wor(l)ds we're made of

Just as for Hobbes there is no sociability, or possibility of a political community – therefore, no subject, no socio-political structure into which he can emerge as such – without language, or Speech; there is no subject, for Lacan, without their subjection into the symbolic. 'The Symbolic' is the name Lacan gives to one of the three 'registers' he understands the unconscious: symbolic, imaginary and real. The symbolic is the place of language, speech, sociability, social norms, rules, and political

processes. In order to exist at all, the subject must exist within a particular context, language, set of social norms and political processes. There can be no subject without the symbolic in which to emerge. “Lacan defines the subject as a position adopted with respect to the Other as language or law: in other words, the subject is a relation to the symbolic order” (FINK, 1996, p. xii-xiii), or, in his own words “beyond this speech, it is the whole structure of language that psychoanalytic experience discovers in the unconscious (…) By "letter" I designate the material medium [support] that concrete discourse borrows from language” (LACAN, 2006b, p. 413).

For Lacan, there is no psychoanalysis as practice without language – and therefore, no psychoanalytical theory, since all psychoanalytical theory is based and derived from psychoanalytical experience – since “psychoanalysis has but one medium: the patient's speech” (LACAN, 2006a, p. 206). And, no psychoanalytical experience at all, no unconscious to which this endeavor must address. “Starting with Freud, the unconscious becomes a chain of signifiers that repeats and insists somewhere (on another stage or in a different scene, as he wrote), interfering in the cuts offered it by actual discourse and the cogitation it informs” (LACAN, 2006d, p. 676). Lacan subscribes to a particular worldview in which there are no things ‘as such’. There are no things ‘as they are, in the world’, to which we, only after their existence, name and give meaning and purpose to, or find these names, meanings and purposes in the essence of such things. For Lacan, things emerge as they refer to words. A chair is nothing without ‘chair’ to name it, and give purpose to its use and existence in the world.

This particular understanding of the world is in tune with what we’ve been discussing regarding a certain linguist turn in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, in which the understanding that truth, meaning and “the names of things lie hidden in the things they designate” (BARTELSON, 1995, p. 145), to the understanding of words as the representation of things, a world in which men starts “asking how a sign could be linked to what it signifies” (BARTELSON, 1995, p. 145) and “[t]he harmonious relation between things are no longer guaranteed by a divine order of the world: what once started in Babel is brought to completion by the end of the sixteenth century”

(BARTELSON, 1995, p. 145-146). This particular worldview is built on a particular interpretation of Linguistics Lacan draws from Saussure and Jacobson. Lacan is explicit in his use of saussurean linguistics, and even goes further on saying his psychoanalytical theory represents a "return to Freud" – a re-reading, or revisiting of freudian psychoanalysis – through saussurean linguistic, which were not available to Freud at the time of his writings, but which Lacan finds could benefit greatly – finding a close dialogue more specifically in Freud's Interpretations of Dreams – from a saussurean reading. In fact, "meaning" seems unimportant to Lacan. As Bruce Fink argues,

> "Lacan insists, instead, upon a dichotomy. Conscious thought is grounded in the realm of meaning, in a striving to make sense of the world. Lacan proposes that unconscious processes have little if anything whatsoever to do with meaning. We can, it seems, completely ignore the whole issue of meaning, that is, the whole of what Lacan calls the signified or signification, in discussing the unconscious" (FINK, 1996, p. 21).

In this particular engagement with language, Lacan draws one of the most basic and foundational premises of his psychoanalytical theory, which is "the primordial position of the signifier and the signified as distinct orders initially separated by a barrier resisting signification" (LACAN, 2006b, p. 415), formalized in the algorithm S/s. The most essential thing to remember here in Lacan's engagement with saussurean linguistic is precisely the lack of an essence in things or words, the resistance both 'things' and 'names' offer to signification, to the coupling of world and word, to any inherent relation between anything and its name. S/s here, then, does not represent or express some sort of relation, proportion or correspondence between one and the other. Quite the contrary, Lacan's reading of the saussurean equation emphasizes the bar between signifier and signified, the inherent disconnection and unbridgeable separation between the two. Following Jacobson and Saussure, Lacan goes on to say that

> "[w]e can take things no further along this path than to demonstrate that no signification can be sustained except by reference to another signification. This ultimately leads us to the remark that there is no existing language [langue] whose ability to cover the field of the signified can be called into question, one of the effects of its existence as a language [langue] being that it fulfills all needs there.

> Were we to try to grasp the constitution of the object in language, we could but note that this constitution is found only at the level of the concept — which is very different from any nominative — and that the thing [chose], when quite obviously reduced to the noun, splits into the double, divergent ray of the cause in which the thing has taken shelter in French, and of the nothing [rien] to which the thing has abandoned its Latin dress (rem).” (LACAN, 2006b, p. 415).

In Lacan’s most famous example regarding this aspect of his theory, we can see how the signifier is not only empty, “the signifier in fact enters the signified — namely, in a form which, since it is not immaterial, raises the question of its place in reality” (LACAN, 2006b, p. 417). In order to portray the lack of inherent connection between signifier and signified, Lacan reminds us of the public urinary segregation in modern western society, in which “Ladies’ bathroom” and “Gentlemen’s bathroom” have basically the same function, and only acquire their properties of “Ladies’ bathroom” and “Gentlemen’s bathroom” in function of their naming as such, by the enamel plaques above each door.

> “What this structure of the signifying chain discloses is the possibility I have — precisely insofar as I share its language [langue] with other subjects, that is, insofar as this language [langue] exists — to use it to signify something altogether different from what it says. This is a function of speech that is more worthy of being pointed out than that of disguising the subject's thought (which is usually indefinable) — namely, the function of indicating the place of this subject in the search for truth” (LACAN, 2006b, p. 420-421 my emphasis)[7].

In Lacan’s psychoanalytical theory I have been able to find room to work through the tensions I share with a certain modern desire to know, the rationality required to be in a position of subject, and the authority which stems from the claim to know. As I have mentioned in a previous section of this chapter, Hobbes builds his political treatise on MAN. Hobbes builds his political theory, as I have argued, from Senses, through Imagination, into Trayne of Thoughts to Speech and Reason. Many

[7] Lacan goes further in ‘*The Instance of the Letter*’ to elaborate on the language-like structure of the unconscious in the correlation between figures of speech and functions of the unconscious Freud identified in ‘*The Interpretation of Dreams*’. He draws the equivalence between the language tropes of *metonymy* and *metaphor* – “[t]he part taken for the whole” (LACAN, 2006b, p. 421) and “*[o]ne word for another*” (LACAN, 2006b, p. 421), respectively – and the freudian concepts of ‘displacement’ (*Verschiebung*) and ‘condensation’ (*Verdichtung*), also respectively (LACAN, 2006b, p. 425).

commentators have also highlighted hobbesian political theory's grounding on mathematical logics and thinking – which we can clearly identify in excerpts such as "When a man Reasoneth, hee does nothing else but conceive a summe total, from Addition of parcels; or conceive a Remainder, from Substraction of one summe from another: which (if it be done by Words,) is conceiving of the consequences of the names of the whole and one part to the name of the other part" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 25-26) –, and in fact we can get a glimpse of newtonian concepts that would be developed nearly a century later such as inertia within that reason in excerpts as "when a thing lies still, unlesse somewhat els stirre it, it will lye still forever, is a truth that no man doubts of" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 12). Hobbes ascribes to Speech a fundamental role in creating and sustaining any form of social and political community, and ties reason and speech together, as we can see in "[c]hildren therefore are not endued with Reason at all, till they have attained the use of Speech: but are called Reasonable Creatures, for the possibility apparent of having the use of Reason in time to come" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 29). I find tension working with these two authors as they have a certain subject of knowledge as their starting point, a place I have time and again desired to inhabit.

The tension these two authors provide and I recognize working through me are not particular to my own special constitution as a being in this world – a place I hope has become somewhat clear throughout these first few developments of my argument I believe does not exist –, but I believe, constitutes and expresses a larger tension upon which modern subject has been built on. As Hobbes seems to build his political treatise on this subject of reason and mathematical logics and proportions – from man to commonwealth and beyond –, Lacan openly attacks both to the Cartesian subject, and a certain autonomous univocal subject derived from american subject psychology[8] –

[8] To which Lacan stands against time and again, as we can observe in these passages "We know what it leads to: to the ever more intentional undertakings of a technocracy; to the psychological standarization of subjects who are seeking jobs; and to acceptance of the established boundaries of society as it currently exists, head bent forward under the [weighty] standart [*étalon*] of the psychologist.

I say that the meaning of Freud's discovery is radically opposed to that" (LACAN, 1987, p. 61). and

"What I will specifically try to define is subversion, and I apologize to this assembly, whose qualifications I mentioned earlier, for being unable to do more in its presence than elsewhere—namely, to take this assembly as such as the pivot of my demonstration, the onus being on me to justify taking such liberties with regard to it.

which one could argue, don't have much of a difference. Even with their seemingly conflicting approaches to the subject, hobbesian political theory and lacanian psychoanalytical theory seem to both derive their understandings of the subject in each of their theories as one whose fundamental connection to themselves and others, and their very ability to take their position of subject is through language. Hobbes's subject emerges through Speech – God given, or in the proliferation of tongues in the tower of Babel –, and Lacan's subject emerges in a symbolic structure composed of language and sociability – language being what Lacan highlights the most about the symbolic. With this in mind, I think it might be useful, after having spent some time in the emergence of a subject in Hobbes, to spend now some time understanding how a so called lacanian split subject also emerges subjected to language.

> "Psychoanalytic experience has rediscovered in man the imperative of the Word as the law that has shaped him in its image. It exploits the poetic function of language to give his desire its symbolic mediation. May this experience finally enable you to understand that the whole reality of its effects lies in the gift of speech49; for it is through this gift that all reality has come to man and through its ongoing action that he sustains reality.
>
> If the domain defined by this gift of speech must be sufficient for both your action and your knowledge, it will also be sufficient for your devotion. For it offers the latter a privileged field" (LACAN, 2006a, p. 264-265).



## 1. 2. 3. Subjection and Alienation

---

Nevertheless, I shall take advantage of your kindness in assuming we agree that a science cannot be conditioned upon empiricism.

Secondly, we encounter what has already been constituted, with a scientific label, by the name of psychology.

Which I challenge—precisely because, as I will show, the function of the subject, as inaugurated by Freudian experience, disqualifies from the outset what, going by the name "psychology," merely perpetuates an academic framework, no matter how one dresses up its premises.

Its criterion is the unity of the subject, which is one of the presuppositions of this sort of psychology; it should even be taken as symptomatic that this theme is ever more emphatically isolated, as if the return of a certain subject of consciousness [*connaissance*] were at stake, or as if the psychical had to obtain recognition as doubling the organism" (LACAN, 2006c p. 672-673).

In Lacanian psychoanalytical theory, the subject emerges through both a relation to and alienation in language. The subject emerges in a deep relation to language because nothing ever exists outside the symbolic realm of language, because "existence is a product of language: language brings things into existence (makes them part of human reality)" (FINK, 1996, p. 25). While emerging through this deep relation with language, the subject also emerges alienated in language, due to language's "foreign" nature. Language, or the symbolic are "foreign" to the subject in the sense that every subject is born into a language and a set of social and political norms and processes they had no part of prior to their birth. Although I might not think of "the symbolic" as interchangeable with "language", since it seems to contain not only language, but also the social and political dynamics in our world; which language nevertheless carries and expresses, but, as I will get to discussing further in this chapter, never fully. The symbolic is "foreign" to the subject to the extent that it is made up of preexisting norms, rules, processes and dynamics of which the subject emerging through it had no part in creating. We are born, and emerge as subjects, in places, languages, families and societies we neither chose nor had any role in the creation[9].

The story goes as follows:

> "we are born into a world of discourse, a discourse or language that precedes our birth and that will live on alter our death. Long before a child is born, a place is prepared for it in its parents' linguistic universe: the parents speak of the child yet to be born, try to select the perfect name for it, prepare a room for it, and begin imagining what their lives will be like with an additional member of the household. The words they use to talk about the child have often been in use for decades, if not centuries, and the parents have generally neither defined nor redefined them despite many years of use. Those words are handed down to them by centuries of tradition: they constitute the Other of language, as Lacan can call it in French (I'Autre du langage), but which we may try to render as the linguistic Other, or the Other as language" (FINK, 1996, p. 5)

[9] I want get a chance to further understand the approximations between Hobbes's state of nature and Lacan's pre-symbolic real, and the possibilities that might open up if we think about both of them as two very similar kinds of retroactive fictions. I hope to do that in the next chapter, as we dive further into the structure and specificities of neurosis and the social contract.

We are born into a world where language, social norms and all other rules are already preestablished, a world in which even our own place is already preconceived in narrative inside our family's history, our parents' lives, our social and economic status and what kind the mobility they allow us in this world. Long before we are born or even conceived, our parents might have talked about us – 'us' in particular or even the abstract idea of having a baby –, and, by this very talking about us and the family, social and political context in which we would be born, created for us a place in our family and in society more broadly. That's here it is the clearest to me in lacanian theory that: 1. we don't even get a choice whether or not to subject ourselves or not to the symbolic, we are already caught up in a symbolic fabric of signifiers even before we are born; 2. we can speak of a 'pre-symbolic real' only as a pedagogical tool for understanding the subject's entry into the symbolic, but always keeping in mind that this pedagogical tool is merely illustrative and – just like there was never neither a state of nature nor a magical moment in which individuals came together and decided to craft and sign a social contract in political theory – there can never be a pre-symbolic real, of which the subject is cut out once it is subjected to language.

Once we are born into this linguistic, social, political, symbolic world, we have to figure out how to survive in it. We attach ourselves to our primary givers, that seem to be somewhat interested in sustaining our life, and we subject ourselves to the language they speak, in order to express our wants and needs so they can be more or less satisfied. This is a painful process in which not only do we learn to communicate our wants and needs through a language that foreign to us – in which we inadvertently were born into and of which we didn't participate (and probably will participate only marginally) on its conception and transformations –, but through which our very wants and needs, and our desire, is shaped. Bruce Fink (1996) uses an example that I find useful. When we are babies and have not yet moved on from a crying stage and developed the ability to speak, we cry, and our care takers try to guess the reason for our crying, our wants and needs based on that cry. We in turn, gaining access to language, learn to formulate our demands to having our wants, needs and desires fulfilled so as to fit our parent's former responses. So, our crying acquires meaning. Not pure meaning, not pure expression from desire, but meaning, some meaning, any

meaning. Crying, that was our response to a discomfort way beyond – and not quite – hunger, was satisfied by bringing us closer to our mother's breast so as to fulfill what was understood as 'hunger'. But it might have been, and probably was something more than 'hunger' and not exactly 'hunger', at the same time. Our cry as we felt a mixture of loneliness, hunger, longing for comfort, amongst many other things, was labeled as 'hunger', as so, as we learn to speak, we learn to express that bundle of feelings as "I am hungry".

> "A child is thus born into a preestablished place in its parents' linguistic universe, a space often prepared many months, if not years, before the child sees the light of day. And most children are bound to learn the language spoken by their parents, which is to say that, in order to express their wishes, they are virtually obliged to go beyond the crying stage — a stage in which their parents must try to guess what it is their children want or need—and try to say what they want in so many words, that is, in a way that is comprehensible to their primary caretakers. Their wants are, however, molded in that very process, for the words they are obliged to use are not their own and do not necessarily correspond to their own particular demands: their very desires are cast in the mold of the language or languages they learn" (FINK, 1996, p. 5-6).

So, when we say we are hungry, we are expressing a number of different feelings and thoughts that may be partially or even not at all covered by the general use of the concept of 'hunger'. That is the way in which I understand how our entry in the symbolic is forced upon us by sociability and need for survival, and, simultaneously, can never fulfill our desire. It always lacks something, one item off that list of thoughts and feelings, or one bit in its intensity or size. And it is always in excess. Whenever we say something, it is not the whole meaning of that word or expression we want to convey, there's always something on that checklist of situations in which to use 'hungry' that we're not exactly feeling at that particular moment, or that we are feeling, but not in that particular intensity or size. So we can begin to come to terms with the understanding that "every human being who learns to speak is thereby alienated from her or himself — for it is language that, while allowing desire to come into being, ties knots therein, and makes us such that we can both want and not want one and the same thing, never be satisfied when we get what we thought we wanted, and so on" (FINK, 1996, p. 7).

That is what Lacan is talking about when he says “the subject’s unconscious is the other’s discourse” (LACAN, 2006a, p. 219), or when he makes reference to an Other at all. This “Other” in which we emerge in a close relation with is this very structure of the symbolic, of the language, sociability and politics that were there before we were even born or conceived, and will stand long after we are gone. A language and society that is foreign to us, to which we had no part in conceiving or creating, and upon which we will have little to none impact at all. “The very expression we use to talk about it—"mother tongue"—is indicative of the fact that it is some Other's tongue first, the mOther's tongue, that is, the mOther's language, and in speaking of childhood experience, Lacan often virtually equates the Other with the mother” (FINK, 1996, p. 7). Although familiar, the language(s) we learn are also strange to us, and that ambiguity is precisely the place from which Lacan sees the subject emerging.

> “All this has been articulated only in a confused way by philosophers who are nevertheless professional. But it is clear that Speech begins only with the passage from the feint to the order of the signifier, and that the signifier requires another locus—the locus of the Other, the Other as witness, the witness who is Other than any of the partners—for the Speech borne by the signifier to be able to lie, that is, to posit itself as Truth.
>
> Thus Truth draws its guarantee from somewhere other than the Reality it concerns: it draws it from Speech. Just as it is from Speech that Truth receives the mark that instates it in a fictional structure.
>
> The first words spoken decree, legislate, aphorize, and are an oracle; they give the real other its obscure authority” (LACAN, 2006d, p. 684).

This point in particular speaks to me insofar as it addresses a certain level of suspicion when it comes to singularities and specificities when it comes to a subject’s emergence in a linguistic, social and political context. This particular understanding of the subject’s emergence as such speaks directly to my desire of understanding the questions that seem to be most important to me: How do our social and political possibilities are shaped as to being what they are? Why can’t we think of anything different past a certain point? What shapes our political possibilities? What is possible in our political thinking? All these questions relate to some extent to our emergence as political subject within a particular linguistic, social and political context. All of them

speak to my desire of understanding how our politics are shaped, by what, and what is possible within that framework. Lacan's understanding of the emergence of the subject in the symbolic, and Hobbes's understanding of politics as based upon a particular subject and a particular political vocabulary, helps me understand our political possibilities as shaped by our linguistic, social and political context. We cannot desire something we cannot even think of. We cannot desire something that can't be formulated and articulated through language. Our desires are trapped inside this linguistic, social and political structure.

> "Insofar as desire inhabits language—and in a Lacanian framework, there is no such thing as desire, strictly speaking, without language—we can say that the unconscious is full of such foreign desires. (…) Other people's views and desires flow into us via discourse. In that sense, we can interpret Lacan's statement that the unconscious is the Other's discourse in a very straightforward fashion; the unconscious is full of other people's talk, other people's conversations, and other people's goals, aspirations, and fantasies (insofar as they are expressed in words)" (FINK, 1996, p. 9-10).

One of Lacan's most famous articulation of this emergence of the subject in an alienation to itself, as an alienation into an-other's desire is the 'mirror stage'. The mirror stage was initially proposed by Lacan as a stage in a child's development – and since then much discussed insofar as its connections to a "developmental" approach based on Gestalt therapy – between six and eighteen months in which a child is able to stand on its feet and look at itself in the mirror. The child looks at itself and, although jubilant upon recognizing its own image in the mirror, it is overwhelmed by the disconnection between the lived experience of inhabiting its own body, and an uncoordinated set of limbs it sees. It is in this disconnection between the lived experience in its own body and the image projected in the mirror that the subject's self is constituted (LACAN, 2006c).

> "The jubilant assumption [assomption] of his specular image by the kind of being — still trapped in his motor impotence and nursling dependence — the little man is at the infans stage thus seems to me to manifest in an exemplary situation the symbolic matrix in which the /is precipitated in a primordial form, prior to being objectified in the dialectic of identification with the other, and before language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject.

> This form would, moreover, have to be called the "ideal-I"—if we wanted to translate it into a familiar register—in the sense that it will also be the rootstock of secondary identifications, this latter term subsuming the libidinal normalization functions. But the important point is that this form situates the agency known as the ego, prior to its social determination, in a fictional direction that will forever remain irreducible for any single individual or, rather, that will only asymptotically approach the subject's becoming, no matter how successful the dialectical syntheses by which he must resolve, as I, his discordance with his own reality." (LACAN, 2006c, p. 76)

Lacan goes on to explain the essential role of the care taker in this moment, which is when he develops the relation between ideal-ego and ego-ideal. The child, not knowing what it is in front of at first, recognizes itself only through the eyes of the adult behind them in the mirror – and it's again a misconnection, a méconnaître between the image the adult has of the child, what they project on to them, and how much of that is communicated to the baby, and the actual baby's perception of itself as all of that that is projected onto it, and in some way, expected of it. This also goes through, once again, Lacan's understanding of subject formation through a structure that is the our own.

> "Here arises the ambiguity of a misrecognizing that is essential to knowing myself [un méconnaître essentiel au me connaître]. For, in this "rear view," all the subject can be sure of is the anticipated image — which he had caught of himself in his mirror — coming to meet him. I won't go back over the function of my "mirror stage" here, the first strategic point I developed as an objection to the supposedly "autonomous ego" in favor in psychoanalytic theory" (LACAN 2006d, p. 684).

Our formation as a subject can only be obtained through the eyes and words of others. The concepts we have for perceiving ourselves a certain way upon looking in the mirror are all estrange to us. Once again, they are the only way we can not only express our feelings, but even feel them at all, even have a grasp or understanding of what is going on "inside" – once we have established that everything going on "inside" can only be a product of everything we experience on the "outside", and that a pure "outside", without our perception, for Lacan, especially our perception as mediated through language, does not exist.

> "It is this image that becomes fixed—this is the ideal ego—from the point at which the subject fixates as ego-ideal. The ego is thus a function of mastery, a game of bearing, and constituted rivalry. In the capture it undergoes due to its imaginary nature, the ego masks its duplicity; that is, consciousness, in which the ego assures itself an indisputable existence (a naivete that is displayed in Fenelon's work), is in no way immanent in the ego, but rather transcendent, since consciousness is based on the ego-ideal as unary trait (the Cartesian cogito does not fail to recognize this). As a result, the transcendental ego itself is relativized, implicated as it is in the misrecognition in which the ego's identifications originate" (LACAN 2006d, p. 685).

Once again, we circle back around to the problem of borders, boundaries and limits, of a the very split between inside and outside that IR is supposedly grounded on. The disciplinary History of IR has the Westphalia Theory as one of their foundational landmarks, by coining the term cuius regio eius religio, which we roughly and rudely equate to "sovereignty" (DE CARVALHO; LEIRA; HOBSON, 2011). This separation between outside and inside, between public and private in the subject are necessary for the consolidation of modern secular politics (BARTELSON, 1995; KOSELLECK, 1988; WALKER, 1993). And, I believe, they are what roots our modern politics, through the modern subject, in subjectivity. Subjectivity being precisely that split between public and private in the subject.

> "The Other, as preliminary site of the pure subject of the signifier, occupies the key [maitresse] position here, even before coming into existence here as absolute Master—to use Hegel's term with and against him. For what is omitted in the platitude of modern information theory is the fact that one cannot even speak of a code without it already being the Other's code; something quite different is at stake in the message, since the subject constitutes himself on the basis of the message, such that he receives from the Other even the message he himself sends. Thus the notations A and s(A) are justified" (LACAN, 2006d, p. 683).

This relationship between subjection and alienation, of "giving up" in order to "join in" are the dynamics I want to explore in my following chapter. There, I hope to explore more specifically, the relationship between the "giving up" both of a "right to all things" in Hobbes and of an "unbound desire" in Lacan's pre-symbolic real. These two dynamics, I want to argue are one and the same, when we see them as preconditions to have access to sociability. To me, they are one and the same thing because of three

reasons. First, they are not really anything, they are retroactive fictions. No one has ever experienced the unbound desire of pre-symbolic real or the state of nature, as much as Hobbes locates it in a distant past or in the societies in the Americas. First, because giving them up are the requirement to enter upon sociality. And, third, and perhaps most overlooked is the fact that giving up everything, we get to have something. If we follow this train of thought, the state of nature and pre-symbolic real are thought of as a sort of "everything", but really, they are nothing, since no one ever gets to experience it. So, by means of giving up everything, which is nothing at the same time, we get something: language and sociability. These are some of the dynamics I want to explore in my following chapter.

## 2. Men and Sign: Social Contract and Neurosis

Wanting to know "how stuff works" in our political life — our practices, dynamics and institutions — has driven me to take political subjectivity "back to basics" and "down to the core". Or so I believed. I turned to our political theory canons as a way to understand the origin of our modern politics and the grounds upon which our political structures were first laid out; and to psychoanalytical theory hoping to dive into the depths of human psyche and discover our most inner workings of how we work and relate to one another and our political authorities and institutions. I used to think if I could finally figure out these codes, I could draw a different blueprint, figure out better ways for out political structure, and finally make some kind of change, make everything better somehow — even though I had/have no idea what "better" means (INAYATULLAH, 2014), even though I already was, and still am aware of the white savior complex involved in my need for heroic change (ZEHFUSS, 2014). The prestigious place Hobbes seems to hold in International Relations Theory and his laying out of a vocabulary in which modern politics could be based upon, on one hand, and the way in which Lacan lays out subject formation as a relation always already containing a dynamic between me and other, inside and outside, mediated by the authority that poses itself as "the law" on the other, are what drove me and allowed for me to cultivate space to understand the process of subject formation, the dynamics between subject and power — or authority, if that's a better way to put it. They've also allowed me to question and the lures of "deeper truths". My engagement with Hobbes and Lacan in this dissertation, then allows me to both address and question these desires in me and in a broader psycho-political scope.

In my previous chapter I have tried to explore the relationship between subject and power, as Judith Butler (1997) puts it: as simultaneous and co-constitutive, in my effort to understand how these dynamics work in the specificities of Hobbes's political theory and Lacan's psychoanalytical theory, in his "return to Freud". Doing so, I have been able to explore the intricate relationship between subject: MAN, as Hobbbes puts

it; and power, as expressed by the sovereign authority of the COMMONWEALTH, or as Hobbes calls this congregation of men's political wills: the Leviathan. As I have tried to put it, there is no Leviathan, no Commonwealth, no political authority without subjects from which the sovereign's power emanates. Hobbes makes this very clear not only in the structuring of his political treatise, building ever so carefully a specific political subject — as I have already argued, from Senses, through Speech, until their Naturall Laws — but more specifically on chapter XVI, as he explains man's need to give up part of their freedoms and power in order to have some kind of institution that allows for sociability amongst men without the constant fear of a gruesome death. And I do believe working with the specific gendered term here allows us to not turn away from the hard question of who could hold the status of political subject, even if the prerequisites for said subjecthood were rooted and dependent on the ownership and access to other people's bodies, such as women and slaves.

This relationship between subject and power is a relationship that permeates Lacan's whole understanding of the subject's emergence as such. I have tried to open up space in the last chapter for me to understand and work through his relation of subject formation through subjection to an already existing powerful social fabric, not only as expressed and formed through, but as constituted first and foremost by language. I have tried to work through Lacan's understanding of the subject's emergence as such as one necessarily rooted in language. The subject emerges first and foremost through the Symbolic, which means: the subject emerges first and foremost through its subjection and use of language as it forms and is formed, changed and finds ways to carry itself through generations, through social and political dynamics. This dynamic is not one strange to what I've been able to understand through the works of Judith Butler (1997) on subject formation: we emerge, and can only emerge as subjects insofar as we are subjected/subject ourselves to power, which also depends on our subjection to it, and our exercise of agency as it's granted to us as subjects to his power. We subject ourselves and, in turn, get to have agency in the structure/society we inhabit; but, on the other hand, we do it because our existence as subject depends on this very (continuous) act of subjecting ourselves.

This is the broader scope, the overview of subject formation as I understand it —other people drawing from other kinds of literature or with a different reading of the same literature I have relied upon might and do have other views. For this second chapter, as I have promised, we take one step further into the specific contexts, subjects and dynamics involve in the kind of subject/structure formation I wish to understand, engage with and address: subjecthood and subjectivity in social contract and neurosis. In my first chapter, I have tried to understand subject formation as a process simultaneously dependent on a linguistic, social and political fabric, and productive – authorizing and acting through the subjects who have emerged through it – of said fabric and structure. Now, I will attempt to take a step further into the specifics of the psychic and political — again, no distinction here, anymore — dynamics I want to understand: the subject's emergence through the signature of the social contract and the entry into the symbolic as a subjection to law and name of the father. In order to understand these dynamics, I will revisit Freud's Totem and Taboo, drawing possible connections between Hobbes's political treatise, and Freud's psychoanalytical theory. This part should follow Freud's own model, as he, in Totem and Taboo itself, made an attempt to draw connections between totemism and neurosis. The understand Freud is able to further develop on the neurotic's child psychic constitution through the oedipal drama and relation to their/his father through his understanding of the relationships of the totemic tribes with their totems and the taboo of incest is on I hope to gain with my attempt of a parallel reading of Freud's and Hobbes's works.

I hope to further in my exploration between with a step into lacanian psychoanalytical theory and pick up subject formation where I have left it in the previous chapter with the introduction of the Name-of-the-Father. This step I hope will allow me to not only understand further lacanian subject formation, but, with our close reading of psychoanalytical theory with political theory to be able to find some connections in the relation the neurotic draws with this figure of the father, and we as political subjects may draw with our (paternal) political authorities.

What interests me most here in this dynamic is: 1. the connections between a primitive — or geographically specific — condition both Hobbes and Freud seem to

rely on to advance their theorization on the one side, and between a hobbesian "state of nature" and a lacanian "pre-symbolic real" on the other, as they both seem to me a retroactive fiction; 2. The connections between the subject's entry in the symbolic, in his emergence as such, as I have already began to explore in the previous chapter, and he subject's subjection to the sovereign in the act of signing the social contract in Hobbes's political treatise. Here I hope to explore the linguistic play — that Lacan was so fond of — between sign as in signification and sign as in the signature of one's name, adhering to the social contract; the name as in the name one writes in this particular political act, and as in the Name-of-the-Father as the law and support to the whole symbolic realm, and the instrument through he child enter the realm of language; the sign and name as the signature of the social contract is the instrument in the process trough which the subject simultaneously gains access to language and sociability and is regulated and through the sovereign power whom he instantiates. The discussion I set up here and explore through the entry in the symbolic order and the social contract through the law and name of the father, I hope will prepare ground for my third and final chapter further step into the dynamics between subject and power, paternalistic authority, or, as I will dedicate most of my time exploring, the heteronormative matrix of the oedipal drama and Freud and Lacan's understanding of subject formation, and what kinds of life are understood as possible, and what kind of political potency the abject forms of life relegated to the out side of symbolization, forms of life whose very existence might pose a threat to this heteronormative matrix.

These are the dynamics that puzzle me the most, and which I have found up until now most productive to interrogate thinking the co-constitutive relationship between subject and "the political", "power", "authority" or any significant that seems to slide at any given moment to represent this bundle of ideas that surround whatever they signify, and whatever signifier that revolve around the ideas these words evoke. As I have mentioned on my introduction to this dissertation, the way I have found to organize my writing is somewhere along the lines of degrees os specificity. In my first chapter, as I have mentioned, I have tried to explore the role of "language" and "the subject" in both hobbesian political theory and lacanian psychoanalytical theory. I have found — or, rather, want to put forward the argument that — language takes on a

structuring role in these theorists' work. This dynamic seems to express a codependent relationship where structure structures itself around a particular model of subjecthood, and a subject only emerges as such within a particular structures which he or she will be made to fit.

Now, on this second chapter I want to address the emergence of the subject and the political structure around him as Hobbes has put it in Leviathan, and the connections that seem to pop out between the hobbesian subject and the Freud's neurotic subject as he puts it in his exploration of the connections between totemism and neurosis in Totem and Taboo. I intend to carry on this chapter, after this exploration, continuing to dive into lacanian subject formation as he goes on to develop his theorization around the themes of the Name-of-the-Father. I chose to explore this particular theme on lacanian psychoanalysis wishing it would address a discomfort I have with the centrality of fatherly figures in our political life, and the predominance of the name-of-the-father in the child's psychic constitution.



## 2. 1. How to live with oneself? How to live with others?

For my fist movement in this chapter, I want to begin with a parallel reading of Freud's Totem and Taboo (2001) and the passages in Hobbes's Leviathan (1997) regarding the transference of power and the actual signing of the social contract. What I wish to explore from these readings are the possible parallels between both the neurotic and social contract subject attachment to authority — Hobbes and Freud (later on taken up by Lacan) present it: as a relationship between contracting subject and the higher instance of the Leviathan/Commonwealth; and the figure of the father.

What I wish to highlight in my reading of this particular piece of Freud's work is not only totemism's supposed unfolding in a particular authority, as Freud narrates it from primitive political organization, into monarchy heavily reliant on monotheism, namely: christianity. Neither do I want to feature exclusively neurosis's connection with totemism as they both show some level of displacement of the ambivalent feelings

towards an once all-mighty and prohibitive father on to the totem animal. What I wish to highlight in my reading of Hobbes and Freud in this section is a particular investment and centrality of the figure of the father as an authority both in totemism and neurosis, an in the social contract. What interests me most in this analysis is to find out more about the ways in which we might be organizing our political demands in a childish format, towards a fatherly political authority. Vladimir Safatle (2015) and Charles Tilly (1985), each in their own way, explore how our political affects are organized in a binary of hope and fear, in which we expect from the state protection from the very threats it creates. What I hope then to navigate in this reading of Hobbes and Freud is the structure through which Freud seems to analyze the relationship of both the totemic tribes with their totem and the neurotic child with their father as a way of understanding the social contract subject's investments in authority, or the law.

I began this project with big dreams of being able to rethink the foundations of our political structures. Find our what's wrong with them, and change them into something better. Better for me meant — and I might confess it still somewhat means — more autonomous, with more power to the people, more power to social movements and other kinds of grassroots movements that are not frozen into institutional politics, where I only seem to see the interest of big corporation and the same dynasties that keep in power throughout the whole country and world, despite the mechanisms of change and alternation of power that are supposed to keep democracies happy, healthy, and able to be governments of the people, for the people, by the people. But now dreams of change seem to have been postponed. I have realized how little knowledge I have of our institutional politics, and still, I have even less knowledge and lived experience in grassroots social movements. I recognize that "(a)ny response to the current paralysis [in contemporary politics] needs to acknowledge the hold that these views [the questions of technocratic administration and the ineluctable psycho-social component to contemporary politics] have on current practices, and to take them as the starting point for the reconstruction of something new" (LUXON, 2013, p. 1). So, for now, for this dissertation, my only wish is to look this beast in the eyes. Look at it. Really look at it. And by "it" I mean what is regarded as the origin stories for both subject and power in our modern imaginary — as I have already mentioned, that is where social

contract comes in this whole story: as a wish to look at the blueprints from which our modern machine was built. I want to look at our relationship with paternal forms of authority, and I want to be able to trace connections with the psychic structures Freud tries to understand, and Lacan carries on re-reading, and the way they seem to speak to each other like more than siblings, but maybe as one and the same. This is what this section is about: looking a particular subject's investment in authority as it seems to be understood by Freud and Hobbes, and maybe realize they just might be one and the same.

### 2. 1. 1. Origin Stories

I take my first step towards the analysis of the connections between neurosis and subjecthood in the social contract with their origin stories. What interests me most in Freud's analysis of totemism and neurosis is the storyline he seems to trace from Darwin's primitive horde to absolutist kings, and modern families. How it is organized as a narrative, instead of an argument. Here, I want to explore the parallels between this story and Hobbes's recourse to a gruesome and grim state of nature from which man would want to rid himself of and enter into the pacts of society.

Freud starts off with Darwin's primal horde: a group led by a violent and jealous father, who keeps all the females to himself and drives all his sons away as soon as they become old enough to pose some sort of threat to his dominance. These sons, ostracized and sexually frustrated, would, at a certain point, band together and rally against the father, kill him and consume his flesh — and any similarity with catholicism I'm sure is mere coincidence. The acts both of killing the father and eating his flesh, according to Freud, are the foundations for the oedipal structure of totemism. The band of brothers resents the father because of his prohibition of mating with the women in the horde and for ultimately expelling them altogether from the group, but they also admire and identify with the father, in his power and sexual potency. So, the band of brothers not only kills the father, taking action on their hate, but also eat his flesh, showing also their respect, admiration and love for what the father once represented.

Freud seems to seek, bringing in this primary aspect of totemism, to show the ambivalence found in the tribes' relations to the totem, in the band of brothers relation to the father, is the same kind of ambivalence he finds present in the neurotic child's relation to his father: an ambivalence which follows an oedipal structure (FREUD, 2001).

Hobbes doesn't exactly start with the state of nature, as I have explored in my previous chapter, but with MAN, individually, in his most intimate connection to the external world: Senses. The state of nature conjecture shows up later, in contrast with the social order enabled my men's congregation through Speech. The idea of a state of nature first appears as an argumentative trope for what it would be if God hadn't granted Men the access to language, "(…) without which, there had been amongst men, neither Common-wealth, nor Society, nor Contract, nor Peace, no more than amongst Lyons, Bears, and Wolves" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 20). It is further along in Hobbes's political treatise, as he ponders "Of the NATURALL CONDITION of Mankind, as concerning their Felicity, and Misery" and mentions a "time men live without a common Power to keep them all in awe", and depicts it as a "condition which is called Warre; and such a warre, as is of every man, against every man" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 70), in which "the life of man [is] solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 70).



This condition of imminent violence and terror amongst all men would derive, as Hobbes puts it, from men's equality in their abilities and, therefore, their equality in their desire. Which I read in

> "[n]ature hath made men so equall, in their faculties of body, and mind; as that though there bee found one man sometimes manifestly stronger in body, or quicker in mind than another; yet when all is reckoned together, the difference between man, and man, is not so considerable as that one man can thereupon claim for himselfe any benefit, to which another may not pretend, as well as he" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 68)

As we can see, the state Hobbes describes men living in before society is no necessarily of actual physical harm amongst people, but of a state of generalized "war", as he puts

it, as “nature of War, consisteh not in actual fighting; but in the known disposition thereto” (HOBBES, 1997, p. 70). This is the foundation of our modern state many — from Tilly (1985), through Campbell (1992), to Safatle (2016) — have argued: fear. What is at stake here is not violence itself, but the state of constant fear of what might happen without someone to enforce the law. Later on this chapter, I will try my best to address the role of the father as the support for the law in Lacan’s take on subject formation. But for now, let’s proceed to the act of signing the social contract.

In both Freud’s and Hobbes’s narratives we can see the play between identity and difference: between what we are now — or what we could be under a commonwealth to unite and regulate us all — and what we once were/what some wild uncivilized people in lands far far away are. Here we can see at play the temporal and geographical displacement of difference acting in both authors as they present these “societies” as abject, and a narrative in which they locate these behaviors as overcome by men now, or belonging to strange peoples — which must be converted and show the ways of civility and put on the righteous path of progress. These displacements can be noted in passages such as when Hobbes attributes these primitive behaviors to “the savage people in many places of America” (HOBBES, 1997, p. 71), and when Freud addresses the totemic tribes as primitive, monolithic cultures, and the few times he does mention one or two specific tribes he uses terms as “savage polynesian” (FREUD, 2001, p. 26) — referring to James Frazer’s studies on maori communities[10]. I want to further explore still one more aspect about these origin stories and their narrative role in both Hobbes’s political theory and Lacan’s psychoanalytical theory as they pertain to this play of identity and primitive/savage/uncivilized difference, but I’m afraid we have to advance further along Freud’s and Hobbes’s stories in order for this point to even make sense at all in this discussion.

At first glance, Hobbes and Freud might seem like opposites in a social theory of power. Hobbes tells a story in which men, in face of an imminent “war of all against all”, give up his “right to all things” and authorize the sovereign. Freud, on the other

[10] The work Freud cites more specifically is from Frazer’s *The golden bough, II, Taboo and the perils of the soul*. London: Macmillan, 1922. p. 136.

hand, tells a story in which men, banished into isolation, out of jealousy and resentment for a violent father, murder said father and instate a new society. But it is in this very moment that we realize the act of giving up power in Hobbes and of taking charge in Freud might just be two sides of the same coin. For it is in the precise moment in which the brothers prospect is one of descending into chaos they instate the prohibitions against the repetition of parricide on the totem and against endogamy. In this parallel reading of Hobbes and Freud, I hope to explore the ways in which the totemic/neurotic longing for the father might instantiate a particularly paternalistic authority.

As I have already mentioned in the previous section, Freud tells us a story of a violent father, that relegates all males birthed from his intercourse with the women of the tribe to exile. These boys, then, band together to overthrow and kill their father, and afterwards, consuming his flesh. The birth of a new community after the parricide, Freud argues, would be precluded by the fear of fratricide. The brothers would perish in their struggle to take the place of the father in an endless infighting for both the monopoly of access to the women of the tribe, and the prestigious position the father once held. As Freud's band of brothers foresees an eternal fall into fratricide after having eliminated the ominous authority of the father they institute the cult to the totem and the taboo of incest into the community. The authority of the father is reinstated without the presence of the actual father — that would have the boys/men banned from the group — in the totem animal, and the women of the group remain forbidden for the brothers, as they instate the law of exogamy — i.e. having to look for mates in other tribes.

In fear of the dissolution of their newly instated society, the prohibition of incest has a powerful practical purpose for Freud's parricidal sons: as each one of the brothers desires to have all the women to themselves would collapse their new founded society, instituting a law against incest would prevent this fratricidal strife. At this point Freud begins to derive totemism from Darwin's primal horde. The totem animal assumes the symbolism for the father, as the tribe surrounds it with rules – most important, abstaining from the women within the same totem – and, out of guilt, defer their obedience to the father not killing the totem. "They thus created out of their filial sense

of guilt the two fundamental taboos of totemism, which for that very reason inevitably correspond to the two repressed wished at the Oedipus complex" (FREUD, 2001, p. 166-7). The ambivalent sentiments towards the father still remain, tough, as the totem, while being honored and preserved in the tribe's everyday life, also becomes the victim of sacrifice in ceremonial occasions. These ceremonial occasions, when the totem meal occurs represent the satisfaction of the triumph over the father, symbolized in the totem, on which the crime of parricide is repeated again and again. In the totem meal, the brothers reenact their identification with the father and their wish to become him.

While in Hobbes we have men in a gruesome state of nature, of war of all against all, for which the only solution seems to be for each man to "lay down this right to all things" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 73) so as to instate a higher power to "keep them all in awe" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 70). These frightened men, then engage in a "mutual transferring of right" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 74), a contract, in which they transfer their authority into a higher political entity. And here the parallel with Freud's tale is crystal clear, insofar as its seems to be the same form of authority, coming from the same fear and suspicion of a state of equality among subjects. Here it seems that it is not from violence or aggressiveness per se that men's fear spring, but from being equally capable of causing each other harm. Just as the brothers in the primitive horde don't seem to trust themselves not to fall in open conflict amongst one another for the women in the tribe — who don't have their statuses as mere objects with no agency and/or their own willingness t mate with either the father, the brothers or any other man or woman, questioned at any time —, so does men in Hobbes's state of nature not trust other men won't take their life competing for something they both desire. Here, both groups claim for an authority on which them all might rely on to keep the peace among all[11].

[11] We should already be suspicious of "peace" right from the start, as many artists and intellectuals living under "pacification" in Rio and elsewhere have put: peace is only another word for war. Meaning: peace is only the discourse state authorities uses to make (ab)use of force in whatever ways and by whatever means they deem necessary or useful. In this regard, artists such as Sabrina Martina, Carol Dall Farra, and all the Poetas Favelados making art and resistance in Rio, and journalists such as Raull Santiago, Thainã Medeiros, Gizele Martins and all of Coletivo Papo Reto and Movimentos, spreading information about police violence and drug policy in Rio and throughout the whole country, have been crucial in my understanding

## 2. 1. 2. The Contract and the Symbolic

The moment in which man gives up his political ability to act and speak, and, as Hobbes have put, moreover, the moment in which men to "lay[s] down this right to all things" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 73) is one I want to particularly explore in parallel and connection with the subject's inauguration in the symbolic, in Lacanian psychoanalytical theory. This moment is, first and foremost, the enactment or performance of a deep paradox in contractualist theory: that the subject, by means of giving up its authority – or authorship, as we have been dealing, the ability to create and, most importantly, to write his own name – and the fulfillment of that exact authority. It is only by having this authority that Man is capable of giving it up. But how could man have this authority prior to a civil state (MARTELL, 2007)? Those questions pertain to a long debate in social contract theory, that I'd like to nod to and acknowledge, but, nonetheless, should not pursue in the limits of this dissertation. I have explored in my first chapter the subject's entry in the symbolic as a necessary trauma the subject undergoes so as they can have access to language, as structure their whole relation with the world and with themselves. For Lacan, this process occurs as it is rooted, as only insofar as it is rooted in language. Language, for Lacan as much as for Hobbes, is what allows a subject's inner monologue — or dialogue — with their own thoughts, language, for both these authors, is what allows for subjects to string together concepts, and not only communicate, but, most importantly, to build space for mutual understanding. This linguistic space for mutual understanding is what I've been discussing when making reference to what Hobbes highlights as the importance Of Speech in his homologous chapter, and as the symbolic in Lacan's topography of the unconscious.

What interest me most here in the connections and parallels between the two authors is the act through which the being has to subject him or themself in order to be able to enjoy sociability and indeed social existence. And this act is precisely the one I

of the dynamic between the concepts of "war" and "peace". I would have not been able to understand this so clearly if it wasn't for their teaching.

have already mentioned many times Hobbes puts as a "lay[ing] down his right to all things" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 73). This laying down of all things is one I find present in Lacan in precisely the process I have narrated in my first chapter, which is the subject's emergence as such by subjecting itself and making use of language. As I have already mentioned, it is a painful process in which the subject also gives up "all things", here understood as unbound desire, as having no words or concepts limiting or interfering with what they want, think or feel.

Why would the subject give up such a precious thing?, one might ask. And to that, I have two "answers". One, if we are to buy into the linearity of the narrative, the subject "gives up" unbound desire for sociability. Of course, unbound desire seems great, but if you can't formulate this desire into a demand and ask for what you want, then it is no good — and if we're take the narrative to the most material level of things, the child, unable to communicate their needs to their caretakers might eventually die from starvation, dehydration, or of some sort of infection for sitting too long in their own filth. But on the other hand — and it won't be difficult to see this is the interpretation I actually prefer —, if we admit there is no such time where the child had not already been introduced to language — not before it was born, and not even before they were conceived, as the parents talk to and about the child even when it's only a fetus or an idea they contemplate —, we might be forced to face the fact that 1. there was no big bang, no original moment in which the child "entered language" — this entry into language is a continuous and repeated process we go through every day; and 2. there was never any choice for the child on whether they were going to "enter the symbolic" or make use of language. Just as there is no choice on whether we accept or not the social contract and its terms, there is no choice on us making use of language and subjecting ourselves to it.

And here we have that both the state of nature and the pre-symbolic real, Hobbes's and Lacan's respective concepts to what there was before sociability, are a retroactive fiction. Meaning: both the state of nature and the pre-symbolic real are rhetorical or even pedagogical tools both Hobbes's and Lacan employ to make their point more compelling, or even to explain this act of "giving up". To "give up" or to

"lay down a right" in this context is doesn't necessarily mean not losing something the subject once had, but rather, to "give up" here in both Hobbes's and Lacan's is to give up the abstract idea that you can have everything or access to all things, in order to have something. Hobbes's and Lacan's subjects in the state of nature and the pre-symbolic real don't necessarily have or have access to anything. But they hold the possibility to, the "liberty" to, as Hobbes puts it when he understands liberty as "the absence of externall Impediments; which Impediments, may oft take away part of a mans power to do what hee would" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 72). And that is precisely what they give up or lay down the right to when they sign the social contract or enter the symbolic, either way: when they are introduced into sociability to the rules upon which they depend to survive and, therefore have to subject themselves to. But, as I have said, this is only illusory. Because there is no actual historical os experienced moment in the processes neither in Hobbes nor Lacan narrate and/or suggest, in which the subject actually has everything. It is all hypothetical. There was never a moment in time when men, living amongst themselves lived in a such a state of lawlessness and fear. Just as there was never a time in a person's life when they weren't already surrounded and permeated by language and sociability. Indeed, Lacan himself at times refers as the pre-symbolic real as something that "never happens", in the fifth year of his Seminar, he refers to "the primordial ideal symbolic moment, [as] one that is completely non-existent. (LACAN, 2017, p. 133). And addresses this moment of

> "perfect identity, simultaneity, or exact superimposition between the manifestation of the intention, insofar as it is the ego's intention, and the fact that the signifiers are ratified, as such, in the Other is at the heart of the very possibility of the satisfaction of speech. (…) [as] the required starting point for understanding that this never happens" (LACAN, 2017, p. 133-134).

Lacan's and Hobbes's subjects have exactly what a writer has facing a blank page: nothing, but a world of possibilities. And, once they start filling out those pages, writing the stories, living their own lives — with themselves and others — then, the possibilities begin to narrow down. They can no longer write any word on the page at random if they want their story to make sense, they can no longer say or do anything and expect to be understood, nor can they walk around doing whatever they want and

no expect the proper social sanctions to teir actions. Once we start writing and living — again, both in the lacanian and freudian context of life with oneself and others —, we not longer have the possibility to be or have everything, but we do get to become and make something.

## 2. 2. Sewn into Contract

Taking on where I left off subject formation in lacanian psychoanalytical theory in our previous chapter, I have to deal with the subject's emergence in, and only insofar as it's in the relation to an Other. We've been able to explore Lacan's "mirror stage" as "the ambiguity of a misrecognizing that is essential to knowing myself [un meconnaître essentiel au me connaître]. For, in this 'rear view', all the subject can be sure of is the anticipated image — which he had caught of himself in his mirror — coming to meet him" (LACAN, 2006c, p. 684). The mirror stage supposedly represents a moment in which the child, not fully in control of his motor functions, finds itself looking at his whole image in the mirror, and perceives itself as a fully-realized being. This "misrecognition" is given to the fact that the discourse that this mythical child enters in order to become a subject is precisely the "Other's discourse", as Lacan affirms: "[i]f I have said that the unconscious is the Other's discourse (with a capital O), it is in order to indicate the beyond in which the recognition of desire is tied to the desire for recognition" (LACAN, 2006b, p. 436). "Being", then becomes. In the sense that "being" is now understood not as a noun making reference to an existence or essential nature, but as a verb, as a position in which the subject is interpellated, a point where he is captured and quilted into the fabric of the symbolic, where it never is, but is always in the process and struggle of becoming.

With this understanding of the subject: a necessarily split speaking subject, born deeply entrenched in language, and fissured in this very entry in language, we take yet another step into our psychic attachments to political authority. This constitutive function of language as it is put in lacanian psychoanalytical theory, is what Epstein recovers for her exploration of agency in the hobbesian contractual theory. Epstein

questions agency in the realist tradition and the constructivist critique and points towards a more productive analysis of the way in which we, as political subjects emerge deeply invested in the figure of the sovereign. Epstein does so by offering a brilliant exploration of Hobbes' Leviathan as Lacan's Symbolic, arguing that "[i]n coining the Leviathan, what Hobbes conjures is non other than the Lacanian Symbolic" (EPSTEIN, 2013. p. 300). Epstein's reading of the Leviathan at the symbolic, as she argues, comprises two levels: a collective level, in which the Symbolic/Leviathan is the very condition for political agency, by way of giving meaning, ordering, and, thus, making possible, all interactions; and, by this very act of creating political agents, hooking them into the collective, quilting them into the symbolic order, having the social contract mark the subject's entry into language. Epstein's double movement into the Symbolic/Leviathan will allow us further insight into the subject's investment in authority, by showing us the symbiotic relation between political and subject, and the ways in which one could not be conceived without the other. In Epstein's own words: "My contention is that returning to appraise the symbol of the Leviathan will draw out yet another level of meaning, beneath the state or the sovereign, that has to do with the very conditions of possibility of political agency itself" (EPSTEIN, 2013. p. 291).



### 2. 2. 1. Symbolic Leviathan

Epstein, then, brings attention to the evident centrality of language in Lacan, and revealing the same, unexpected — for what IR Theory has taken Hobbes as —, centrality in Hobbes. "For Lacan, as for Hobbes", she argues, "speech – our ability to signify, to make meaning – is what constitutes us as political animals" (EPSTEIN, 2013. p. 301). And banal as this statement might seem, this is the central point from which the collective level of her reading of the Leviathan as the signifier of the Symbolic takes root in.

She begins her argument in the state of nature, pointing to a "inherent disconnect between signifier and signified, o word and their meaning" (EPSTEIN, 2013. p. 302), as every man's notion of good and evil depends on what he sees fit to

the fulfillment of his immediate desires. The state of nature is then, a "space of meaninglessness. [Where h]umans cannot understand each other since the same words hold different meanings for every person. (…) no language, in the sense of a collective, transmittable sets of meaning that can provide the basis of a common understanding" (EPSTEIN, 2013. p. 302). The state of nature, Epstein derives, is devoid of any possibility for collective action, being only the place for "sound and fury, signifying nothing" (EPSTEIN, 2013. p. 302). The Leviathan, then, marks the institution of a symbolic order, a structure of assigned shared meaning for words and actions. Once instituted through the social contract, The Leviathan symbolizes "an open-ended signifier that necessarily eludes all attempts to pin it down to a set of signifieds, because it operates as the master signifier that designates the Symbolic at large" (EPSTEIN, 2013. p. 304). Thus, giving us the very shared-code into which we will be captured into, and the Other in which we will address our question towards. "In this reading, then, the Leviathan designates not a particular type of political order, conditioned upon sovereignty, but what makes possible ordered interactions in the first place, whether at the national or international level" (EPSTEIN, 2013. p. 290).

In the individual level, the contract symbolizes a pact into which all subjects enter and submit to, thus, creating a strong political bond. The pact into which the Leviathan is instituted, then, gives birth to a particular symbolic order, capturing its subjects into particular positions. Thus, the

> "contract institutes not merely the monarch's subject, not merely the political subject (or the subject of a certain kind of political order). Rather, it founds the speaking subject itself, which is also always split. It constitutes the individual qua political animal. This is the true meaning of that symbolic pact: it is an exchange of the freedom to do however one pleases against language and the ability to act politically. It is underwritten, and herein lies Hobbes's Lacanian insight, by a symbol, the Leviathan" (EPSTEIN, 2013. p. 309).

Thus, the symbolic order of the Leviathan institutes subjects as autonomous, functional member of a political body, invested in a sovereign Other who assigns the meanings of which the subject's very existence as a political agent depend on.

Epstein's theorization of the Leviathan as ordering the symbolic thus takes us a step further into the subject's investment in political authority in the sense that it is not any order, brought about by chance that the subject in question is invested in. The subjects very investment in a particular ordering of the political signals to his dependency on this particular, sovereign, paternal, ordering. Political authority then, becomes no other than sovereign power. And, as we have seen with Freud, sovereign power derives from paternal authority.

### 2. 2. 2. "What's in a Name?": Authorship, Authority and Name-of-the-Father

The "giving up" – whether it be of authority, of a "right to all things", of wholesomeness, or of whatever mythical state one was thought to be before emerging as a subject in and to society and oneself – seems to, in both Hobbes and Lacan, to be tied to a significant role of one's name. Whether it be the name one "signs" upon entering the social contract, the name through which one is interpellated and constituted as a subject (BUTLER, 1997), the name through which someone is identified and singularized in not only society's but one's own family structure, or sewn into the symbolic, a name is always the thing through which we connect with "power", "structure" or "authority".

In Hobbes, that happens through someone's status as a person, and the ability of this person to sign their own name. And I want to emphasize here both the possessive pronoun and the adjective that characterize "name" as something intrinsically belonging to the subject who signs the social contract. I call a particular attention to this because to have a name in this particular society is tied to the luxury of political subjecthood. I am, of course, not talking about someone's first name, their nickname, of some other set of sounds of letters used to identify or call on to someone. I am talking about someone's last name, the name they use in legally binding documents – and even as we use to cite someone's work as a reference –: the name of someone's father. Many people don't get to have this sort of name, or take ownership over it, anyways. Women go from "Miss" to "Mrs", or rather, they go from Miss First-Name Father's-Last-Name

to Mrs First-Name Husband's-Last-Name. And it's not unusual to call a married woman by their husband's full name, like Mrs Husband's-First-Name Husband's-Last-Name[12]. Regarding the same issue of owning someone's own name, black people who have been kidnapped from their homes and brought an ocean away to serve as slaves have often been stripped not only of their culture and humanity, but – as a part of that de-humanization – have also been stripped of their names in their mother-tongues. A similar process happened to the indigenous people living throughout the American continent. The one who have not been slaughtered, have been converted – and, they too, stripped of their culture, heritage, language, but this time, not humanity – by priests who baptized them, and renamed them to fit their entering into a different, modern european world.

For Lacan, the Name-of-the-Father is what gives support to the law, to the Other upon who we depend for our emergence as subjects. The father's structural position in the Oedipal drama, qua Name-of-the-Father, is what allows us to function as subjects, have access to the symbolic and exist both socially and psychically. In this section, I will only hint and point towards the mechanics and dynamics of the Name-of-the-Father. Here, what interests us in the support the Name-of-the-Father gives/has to give to our emergence in the Symbolic, and the heteronormative and patriarchal structure that has – as I have already hinted in my last paragraph. I intend to dive more substantially in my next and final chapter, as I put this lacanian into context our gendered realities and join in a feminist critique of this particular point in Lacan's work.

The social contract is signed by "[a] person, (…) whose words or actions are considered, either as his own, or as representing the words or actions of another man, of or any other thing whom they are attributed, whether truly or by fiction" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 88). So here we can see political agency resting on autonomy and freedom: to be a political subject, to be able to act and authorize others to act on one's behalf. It is to, first and foremost, to own one's own person, words and actions — what already

[12] Eg: A girl named Mary Smith, daughter of Robert Smith – who gave her "Smith" as her last name – upon marrying John Johnson will be known no longer as Mary Smith or Miss Smith, but as Mrs Mary Johnson, or even Mrs John Johnson. While both Robert Smith and John Johnson will be born, go through their whole lives and die, respectively as Mr. Robert Smith and Mr. John Johnson.

gives us the gender, race, age and mental health cut right from the start, as women and black people were considered property of their husbands and masters, respectively (if not stripped away altogether of their humanity, in the case of black people), and either children, elders and people with mental health issues could be considered as not being owners of their own words and actions. This right of owning one's words and actions, of performing any action is called authority. "So that authority is always understood a right of doing any act: and done by authority, done by commission, or license from him whose right it is" (HOBBES, 19997, p. 89). And, as the contracting parties sign the social contract, they place their authority upon, their right to their own words and actions, to the entity they are now creating in the act of the contract, referred to by Hobbes as the Commonwealth or the Leviathan. This higher entity to whom the authority of all the contracting parties have laid their authorities, whom supposedly now owns all of their rights to words and actions is then, called an actor. "(…) [E]very man giving their common representer, authority from himself in particular; and owning all the actions the representer doth, in case they give him authority without stint: otherwise, when they limit him in what, and how far he shall represent them, none of them owneth more, than they gave him commission to act" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 90).

This transference of action, as I have pointed out numerous times throughout this chapter, is understood as necessary in order for men to step out of a state of constant fear and a certain level of paranoia that others might pose a threat to their life or to the property of their belongings — since the institution of private property is yet inexistent, along with many others only life in society[13] can allow for. And the subjects apt to enter upon this transference of rights, as Hobbes seems to understand it, are the ones given the right to "govern their owne bodies" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 85), as opposed to "[i]nanimate things, as a Church, an Hospital, a Bridge" who "cannot be Authors, nor therefore give Authority to their Actors"; neither can "[c]hildren, Fooles, and Mad-men that have no use of Reason", but those "may be Personated by Guardians, or Curators"

[13] I say "life in society" insofar as Hobbes himself regards sociability as a product of *speech* and the exchange among men that allows for "Common-wealth" and "Contract" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 20).

(HOBBES, 1997, p. 90). Authors bound together, having their authority transferred are, then represented by One Person.

> "A Multitude of men, are made One Person, when they are by one man, or one Person, Represented; so that it be done with the consent of every one of that Multitude in particular. For it is the Unity of the Representer, not the Unity of the Represented, that maketh the Person One. And it is the Representer that beareth the Person, and but one Person: and Unity, cannot otherwise be understood in Multitude.
>
> And because the Multitude naturally is not One, but Many; they cannot be understood for one; but many Authors, of every thing their Representative saith, or doth in their name; Every man giving their common Representer, Authority from himselfe in particular; and owning all the actions the Representer doth, in case they give him Authority without stint: Otherwise, when they limit him in what, and how farre he shall represent them, none of them owneth more, than they gave his commission to Act (HOBBES, 1997, p. 90).

What I am trying to do here with this particular movement is to understand the relation between giving up our political authority – which seems always embedded in the paradox of both giving up and exercising one's authority –, or "right to all things" and a sort of neurotic attachment to power. This feels important to our political lives because this laying down of rights is not something that happens once, in our childhood, as we, once and for all, subject ourselves to language, neither at some mythical moment of the signing of a social pact between our ancestors, giving birth to our society. Giving up agency and wholesome is something we face every day, and is something that is at the very core of our political lives. So, understanding this dynamic, I hope to be closer to understand our neurotic attachments to power.

Lacan, I want to argue, also recognizes the authority in a name, particularly in the father's name insofar, as Butler puts it, as it functions as "a contingent and open organizing principle for the formation of political groups" (BUTLER, 1993, p. 208)". Indeed, Butler argues that "[i]t is of no small significance that proper names are derived from the paternal dispensation of its own name, and that the performative power of the paternal signifier to "name" is derived from the function of the patronym" (BUTLER, 1993, p. 211). And it is indeed this performative power – the power of bringing

something into action or existence by speech – what I want to explore in Lacan's Name-of-the-Father. I recognize a parallel between the Name-of-the-Father in Lacan and authorship in Hobbes precisely by this performative power of authorizing a subject as such and into action. Having authorship, a subject can sign the social contract and enter upon this society of subjects under the Leviathan, and by the Name-of-the-Father a subject is granted the support of law for the Other upon which he relies to become a subject. Indeed Lacan states that

> "it is between a man's proper name qua signifier and the signifier that metaphorically abolishes it that the poetic spark is produced, and it is all the more effective here in bringing about the signification of paternity in that it reproduces the mythical event through which Freud reconstructed the path along which the mystery of paternity advances in the unconscious of every man" (LACAN, 2006b, p. 423)

Here, I want to highlight the importance of the Name-of-the-Father, and bring our attention to the patrilineal support it gives to the law the subject undergoes do emerge as such both in Lacan and Hobbes. Here, the name of the father orders. It puts things in their place. It provides meaning and authorizes subjects. And, insofar as this chapter goes, that is as far as I want to go. In my next chapter, I want to have proper room to explore where the device of the Name-of-the-Father in the broader context of the subject's relation to its mother, its emergence in the symbolic, and the exclusion this device promotes and depends upon to function as such, bringing sense and order into the world.



## 2. 2. 3. Politics of ambivalence / The ambivalence of politics

The ambivalent sentiments towards the father – and transference of the ambivalent feelings to a "totem" animal –, Freud argues for, is present in the structure of neurosis as it it in totemism. In Totem and Taboo (2001) he presents two cases, one from Sándor Ferenczi[14] and one from his own practice of two little boys' phobias of

[14] Here, Freud cites Ferenczi's 'Ein kleiner Hahnemann', published in 1913 in the Int. Z. Psychoanal and later, in 1916, translated into english in *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis* as 'A Little Chanticleer'.

two different animals: little Árpád, Ferenczi's patient/subject, who had a fear of chicken; and little Hans, who presented a fear of horses. Little Hans had a terrible fear of horses, not only that the horses might come into his room and bite him, but also that they might die. And little Árpád had a fear of chicken, connected to an incident he had during summer vacation, when a chicken tried to bite off his penis as he urinated near a hen house. The little boys' fear, as Freud indicates, points to the ambivalence in totemism, as in later stages of the resolution of their phobias, it develops into interest and identification with the once feared animals. Little Hans begins not only to approach horses with admiration and interest, but also to jump about like one and bite his father, as well as not hesitating to identify his parents with larger animals. And little Árpád, coming back to the same place where the incident had happened a year later, takes an interest in the chickens, and goes on to imitate their sounds and movements, chase them around and slaughter them festively, while singing and dancing, and even petting and kissing their little heads, after he had chopped them off. Little Árpád even went on to identify his father a rooster, his mother a chicken and him as a little chick several times.

Freud, then, goes on to analyze these children's ambivalent feelings towards their fathers through the structure of the oedipus complex, as their fear/admiration for their respective animals denotes a fear/admiration for their respective fathers. Little Hans' fear that the horse might die, Freud reveals, indicates a fear that his own father might be absent, that is, going off on a trip or dying. And little Árpád's fear that the chicken might bite off his penis indicates a fear that his father might also castrate him. Freud also reveals the boys' admiration for their fathers playing out into this fear of castration, not only in little Árpád's event with the chicken, but also with little Hans' indication that his father big penis might threaten his own. Finally, following the identification of the oedipal structure into the children's fear, Freud points to a perceived competition for the favors of the little boys' mothers. Little Árpád's fascination with chickens, including them copulating with rosters and laying eggs plays a big part in his curiosity regarding sex and Ferenczi even reports of him mentioning marrying his neighbor, sisters, cousins and – most important – his mother. And little Hans' fear that the horses – and, therefore his father –, as Freud reminds us, is not only a fear that that might happen, but also a deep desire of his father being absent, so he

wouldn't have to compete for his mother's favors. This is a most important element in the oedipal structure of neurosis/totemism. As the fear and admiration for the father/totem are not mutually exclusive or even alternating, but constitutive of the oedipal structure's very core: its ambivalence. As Freud point out,

> "[t]he hatred of his father that arises in a boy from rivalry for his mother is not able to achieve uninhibited sway over his mind; it has to contend against his old-established affection and admiration for the very same person. The child finds relief from the conflict arising out of this double-sided, this ambivalent emotional attitude towards his father by displacing his hostile and fearful feelings on to a substitute for his father. The displacement cannot, however, bring the conflict to an end, it cannot effect a clear-cut severance between the affectionate and the hostile feelings. On the contrary, the conflict is resumed in relation to the object on to which the displacement has been made: the ambivalence is extended to it." (FREUD, 2001. p. 150)

This ambivalence is very much present as totemic system flourishes and the brothers that once killed the father vow to respect the totem's life and not repeat the deed, and the totem – as a surrogate for the father – provides protection, care and indulgence, with the relief of conscience for the brothers that "if the father was good as the totem, we wouldn't have killed him" (FREUD, 2001. p. 168). The totem becomes a father-like god, and so remains until the longing for the father grows and the father-god regains his human shape. Freud points out to an increasing importance of the son as his physical capacities are needed with the rise of agriculture, and with the displacement of the father-religion to a son-religion in the figure of Christ, offering himself in sacrifice for his brothers, and replacing the father, as the brothers consume his flesh and blood, at the totem meal. However, that doesn't subside the authority of the father, as the son's sense of guilt for the ambition to take the place of the father and lust over the mother "found expression in myths which granted only short lives to these youthful favourites of the mother-goddesses and decreed their punishment by emasculation or by the wrath of the father in the form of an animal" (FREUD, 2001. p. 177). Thus, although introduction of human father-deities slowly turns a fatherless society into a patriarchal one, the gulf between the new fathers of families and the almighty primal father still allows for the longing for the father to persist. Here I would like to highlight that this longing – a longing both to possess the same powers as this

omnipotent father and to submit to it – is one we keep reenacting in our calls for an almighty paternal figure to come in, cavalry and all, to magically save us at the end, in our political lives.

In his investigation of totemism and neurosis, Freud focuses on the ambivalence of the sons' – both the neurotic child's and the band of brothers' – feelings towards the father as manifested through fear and admiration to trace his points of agreement between the both relations. Thus, Freud argues for a common oedipal structure to the neurotic's relation to his father and the tribe's relation to the totem. In this chapter, I have been able to take one step further into the specificities of subject formation as Hobbes, Freud and Lacan theorize it. I have tried to draw not only a parallel, but a connection between the emergence of the subject insofar as Freud and Lacan theorize it in psychoanalytical theory, and Hobbes in his political treatise. Freud's theorizing upon the similarities between totemism and neurosis have been invaluable to me in my own exploration of the similarities between the neurotic subject and the social contract subject. Their shared longing and tense relation with paternal figures is what opened up my curiosity for exploring this theme further, and the further critique into the heteronormativity in the oedipal structure is what keeps my desire in movement. I hope to be able to address these critiques in my following chapter, as well as go further into the logics operating with the device of the Name-of-the-Father. What I wish to explore in this following chapter is precisely this ambivalence towards the figure of the father as it is structurally positioned in the Oedipal drama.

## 3. In whose name?: Paternal Authority in the Oedipus Complex

Throughout my dissertation, I have tried to nurture an honest voice and not hide that what is at stake for me here is as much about social contract and psychoanalytical theory and readings of Hobbes and Lacan, as it about my desire to know. I have written about Hobbes, Freud and Lacan as much as about myself. I have tried to share my particular investment in the understandings these men had of our political fabric, and how their understandings did not in fact only shaped or contributed for what "politics" is or were at any given moment after their writings. It is part of my effort here on this dissertation to try to address the play not only in the authority to which they seem to refer to and write about in these canonical disciplinary texts, but the authority these authors have and exert over us, disciplinary by passers, as canons. In this dissertation, I hope I can understand authority not only as governmental, familiar, but as disciplinary, social, in a broader concept of "political"[15]. In this dissertation, I want to understand how do we emerge as subject in this particular fabric, what does it mean to emerge in the particular socio-politico-linguistic fabric we do, and, what are the possibilities for change in that relation between subject and power, agent and structure. And as much as both Hobbesian social contract theory and Lacanian psychoanalysis have had their sort of lure over me throughout this process, I have also been at odds with what is theorized and the particular subjects who emerge and those who are denied existence, or exist as abject in this particular theorizing.

Throughout the chapters and pages of this present dissertation I have engaged and speculated over possible relations between Hobbes's Social Contract subject and

[15] This might be read as controversial to the point I will try to not only reconstruct, but, in my writing, join the ones to hold it, which is the positions Oedipus complex as merely structural or formal. In my attempt to understand how paternal authority might extrapolate the private realm of the family, I hope to careful enough as not to imply the positions as authorities can be fulfilled by anyone, or that the analysis of family and society are interchangeable. On the contrary, I hope, throughout this chapter, while drawing the connections between paternal and authority, to explain my understanding of the relationship between these two terms, and how, as I want to argue in my next chapter, the positions within the structures of power through which we emerge as subjects are not interchangeable, but rather very solid.

Lacan's split speaking subject of the unconscious. I have tried to do this with different levels of specificity. Doing so gave me a chapter on a particular structuring role of language to both Hobbes's and Lacan's – one last time, I hope: in his return to Freud – theories, and one other chapter, more specifically on the emergence of these/this subject(s) not only in language, generally, but as neurotic political subjects, in relation not only to their particular families – as psychoanalytical theory at time focuses on –, but also to wider socio-political structure, as we have it in the Commonwealth or Leviathan theorized by Hobbes. Following the steps of Judith Butler (1993; LACLAU; ŽIŽEK, 2000), I have tried to hint at the exclusions upon which this particular subject – since I made the attempt throughout my previous chapter to argue that the subject of social contract and that of neurosis just might be one and the same – has been built upon. I have not explored this more thoroughly in the previous few chapters, but now, in this third and final chapter, I hope to step yet further into the specificities of subject formation as Hobbes and Lacan understand it, and the exclusions[16] through which they theorize subjecthood. This will mean a stepping into the dynamics of the Name-of-the-Father, as Lacan puts it, as a structural position upon which the law of the symbolic relies, and, therefore, the entire process of subject formation. And, of course, this will also mean a questioning of this structure of emergence of the subject, and his dependence on this Name-of-the-Father. And, furthermore, this will also, and mostly, bring me to an engagement with the set of questions Butler raises in her debate with the so called 'structuralist' position – more specifically through her debate with both Laclau and, more intensely, Žižek – the heteronormative readings of Lacan's theorization, and the abject position homosexuality always seems to take.

In this engagement, I hope to take Lacan on his declaration in multiple occasions, following Freud's method, that any piece of psychoanalytical theory

[16] Here, I want to bring out one specific point on Judith Butler's (2004) theorization on norms: exclusion. Through her work theorizing norms, "exclusion", for Butler never meant nonexistence, but, rather, the abjection and othering through which what was held as "normal", as the norm, was differentiated and delimited. This play of exclusion and inclusion, of limits and borders is one deeply embedded and in fact central to the discipline of International Relations, as our very studies can always be boiled down to these dynamics. Affirmation of self through othering – and aggressive behavior towards that other – is not strange to the studies of IR. We study wars, genocides, humanitarian disasters, migrations of all sorts, development, inequality. But, somehow, we seem to forget that our work boils down to differentiating self from other, and drawing the limits between those two (WALKER, 1993).

emerges necessarily from practical clinical experience. Here, I my effort is to locate Lacan and Freud's endeavors as historically contingent, rather than a universal truth. Stemming from late 1800's and early 1900's Austria — and even some mid 1900's London as Freud fled from nazi persecution, a historical context which allowed him to write and us to have a piece such as Moses and Monotheism (1939) — right until mid-1900's Paris, Freud and Lacan's theorization and clinical experience is one very much focused on a particularly small territorial space, and a particularly narrow cultural scope. In this particular chapter, I want to take in some of the accusations of a culturally — historical and geographical — specific heteronormative and phallocentric aspects to Freud and Lacan's psychoanalytical theory, as they've limited themselves to the particular scope of individuals who have been brought up in societies where the nuclear heterosexual bourgeois family was the norm. What I hope to attain from reading these two psychoanalytical theorists in their particular contexts is not only joining in the already existing feminist critique to their work — which in itself would already have helped me a lot in terms of finding myself and here I stand in this debate —, but also thinking through the normative character psychoanalytical theory takes on not simply describing patients and symptoms, but prescribing who gets to inhabit the (social and political) category of subject, and who gets to be relegated to the role of the abject constitutive outside. This kind of psychoanalytical theory seems – through the its lack of questioning of a certain ahistorical and asocial structuring of the subject's emergence, not only describes the particular processes and context thought which a subject goes in order to become and emerge as a subject, but indeed a narrative of a process and context through which a subject must go through in order to become and emerge as such.

Now, of course, some might argue — and this seems to be the base of much of Butler's and Žižek's disagreements regarding Lacan's psychoanalytical theory of subject formation — that the positions on the Oedipal drama are simply structural, and anyone, regardless of genitalia or chromosome configuration (or any other naturalizing discourse upon sex) and anyone, regardless of any of those characteristics, can assume the positions on either end of this structure. I will dedicate my next and final chapter on this debate and my readings and positioning in it. But for now, for this chapter, my

intention is to present properly the device of the Name-of-the-Father, and its workings, is to challenge this structuralist view on the Oedipal drama and to understand the dynamic of sexual differentiation psychoanalytical theory such as the one authored by Freud and Lacan depend upon to exercise their claims to truth.

### 3. 1. Name-of-the-Father

In the previous two chapters to my dissertation, I have tried to grasp the process of subject formation in hobbesian social contract theory and lacanian psychoanalytical theory, through questions like how do subjects emerge as such, and what kinds of structures/power/authorities they authorize? My path through these authors and their theories have lead me to understand said emergence of the subject as an emergence through language. I have found that the structuring function language plays in Hobbes's political treatise was an answer, or copping mechanism, to the lack of meaning he found in sixteenth-century Europe around the concept of sovereignty. Hobbes's attempt, as I have tried to show, as an attempt to build a vocabulary upon which a rather chaotic Europe where religious order seemed to be crumbling down. That order was founded upon the figure of the subject, the one he spends one fourth of his political treatise building from the ground up. And, at the same time, that order demanded that the subject "read thyself", so he could, through that relation to himself, his own thoughts and desires, he could begin to wove a relationship with his fellow man – stress on the masculine pronouns. I have found this emergence in language in the lacanian imperative that the child enters the realm of the symbolic, in order to foreclose the real, and have the imaginary somewhere along with them, and inaugurate the subject's topography of the unconscious. The subject, for Lacan as well as for Hobbes, seems to emerge as such insofar as it has access and/or ability to navigate sociability.

Hobbes stresses the importance of language in human society, holding speech as the unique trait that distinguishes us from "Lyons, Bears, and Wolves" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 20), and Lacan holds language as the structure of the unconscious throughout his entire work, from his engagement to saussurean linguistic, through his

understanding of freudian mechanisms such as condensation and displacement, respectively, as metaphor and metonymy (LACAN, 2006b, p. 425), to his very grounding of the language-like of the unconscious. Hobbes seems to find harbor in language in a time when the meaning of sovereignty seemed to shift, and the political order barely kept afloat. He seemed to find ways to express this changing scenario through the biblical tale of the Tower of Babel: a tale of ambitious men who thought they could build a tower so high as to reach God high upon the skies, which was met by God's wrath, as he made each man speak a different language, so their delusions of grandeur would come crashing down, with their inability to understand one another, and find meaning amongst themselves. One of the most important things we seemed to have emerged with from this conundrum was the separation between the public and the private, which was able to forge a new subject, upon which the new modern politics could be built upon. For this particular enterprise, it didn't seem as important that all men agreed in every single aspect of how should one lead life as much as that they all respected the same sovereign authority, and could keep their personal opinions to themselves – in their private realm – and out of the uncontaminated real of – public – politics. For Lacan, a fracture in the subject such as this seems to be evident. And, in fact, all lacanian psychoanalytical theory, as far as I have been able to understand it, seems to rely on a primary split of the subject. This split depends upon the entry of the subject in the symbolic order, the order of language, of speech, of sociability and of all the institutions and norms that this particular subject did not take part in creating, but nonetheless must subject itself if it wants to emerge as such, and in fact survive in a world where symbolization is required for communication and attainment of sustenance and any sort of assistance usually required in the early stages of our lives.

And this is here hobbesian political theory and lacanian psychoanalytical theory seem to converge and intertwine for me. In fact, not only for me, but for Charlotte Epstein (2013) as well. Which, as I have mentioned, was the one to write the first piece of literature I came in contact with drawing some sort of connection between the Symbolic and the Leviathan. Epstein (2013) puts forward a reading of Hobbes's Leviathan as Lacan's Symbolic. She does so based on two main points: the moment of entry into the symbolic/social contract – which I have explored in my last chapter; and

the function of the Leviathan as quilting point. These two points will be explained further in my subsection on authority on this chapter. Here, I follow her insights, understanding the civil state, the Leviathan, as the socio-linguistic fabric through which subjects emerge. Here, for me, as I already have mentioned, the moment in which the subject gives up his "right to all things" (HOBBES, 1997, p. 73) to sign the social contract, and the child gives up the access to unbound desire through a pre-symbolic real, so they can access our socio-linguistic world, are the biggest parallel from which I derive all my further ponderations. This giving up as a primary condition to join in society, language and/or a political community I was able to understand as one which shapes our relation to the political authority – insofar as the state might be understood as the one producing the very threat of which it swears to protect us (CAMPBELL, 1992; SAFATLE, 2016; TILLY, 1985) – and to our own desire(s) – insofar as we only are able to symbolize, understand or give shape in any sort of way to our desire(s) through the always excessive and lacking signifiers we have at hand.

In my previous chapter I feel like I was able to understand a particular sewing of the subject into the social contract's fabric as their condition of emergence as a subject in a particular society. This "sewing into" for Lacan seems to be from where the subject derives meaning and the support of the law – in the Oedipal drama symbolized by the father, or, better, the Name-of-the-Father – from which he can truly emerge in the realm of language and sociability as a subject. I want to dedicate this chapter further to understanding the device of the Name-of-the-Father, which Lacan highlights as the essential support for the subject's emergence as such. I do this as an attempt to have some sort of grasp: 1. the centrality of the father in the oedipal drama and the emerge of the subject in lacanian psychoanalytical theory in its own terms; 2. join in and explore the feminist and gender critique of a certain cis-heteronormativity and phallocentrism upon which lacanian psychoanalytical theory seems to be rooted in, and understand the possibilities of change emerging in a historically situated understanding of what seems to be foreclosed in the subject's emergence (BUTLER, 1993; BUTLER,; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000).

### 3. 1. 2. Stepping into the Symbolic

For this exploration on the Name-of-the-Father and its role on the oedipal drama, I go back to the story many psychoanalytical theorists – such as Lacan, Freud, Klein and Winnicott, each emphasizing one thing or another – have for the emergence of the subject as such. When a child is born, usually its primary care giver is their mother. She is the one to provide, from her own body, from her own breasts, the sustenance that the child needs to survive. She usually has the most skin to skin contact and spends the most hours with them. She is usually the one to wake up at night or in time of the day stop her activities to respond to the baby's cry. The child, thus, has the impression – and most of these authors will attribute that specifically to the connection established while nursing – that the mother's body is an extension of their own. And that period when the child has their cries automatically responded Freud has attributed the name of the narcissistic moment when the child spends as "his majesty, the baby"[17]. It comes a moment, as we saw, when this dynamic or position must eventually come to an end. As the baby develops more independence, they realize the mother turning her attention to other things. As we've been able to understand through Lacan's piece on the mirror stage, the little being also comes to realize that their mother's body is not their own – along with the contrast of the realization of a full formed image of a whole being, while they still have little to none control over their own movements (LACAN, 2006d). With all of this, comes the realization that they are not their mother's whole world, and in fact she might have some other reason for her "comings and goings", as Lacan puts it.

> "The mother comes and goes. It's because I am a small being who is already caught up in the symbolic, because I have learnt to symbolize, that it's possible to say that she comes and goes. In other words, I perceive her or I do not perceive her, the world changes with her arrival, and it may disappear.
>
> The question is – what is signified? What does she want? I really like it to be me that she wants, but it's very clear that it's not just me that she wants. There are other things at work in her. What is

[17] Freud coined that expression on his 1914 paper *On Narcissism: An Introduction*, under the original title: *Zur Einführung Des Narzissmus*, in the sixth volume of the *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse*, pages 1-24.

> at work in her is the x, the signified. And the signified of the mother's comings and goings is the phallus" (LACAN, 2017, p. 159)

This is regarded as a crucial moment in the subject/child's formation.

In the already established vocabulary of this dissertation: the child emerges as a subject in language through their relation to an Other. This happens insofar as language is something exterior to the child, something the child had no part in creating, but must, nonetheless subject themself to in order to survive. The relation to this Other is established through the child relation to its primary caretaker, often its mother. That is why, in english, it is customary to say that the subject's emergence in language happens through their mOther tongue. In the process of subjecting ourselves to this strange language, we have our desires molded by these worlds available to us in this pre-packaged deal. Desire, then – as much as feelings, thoughts, wants, needs, etc – are not prior to language, but made possible by it. And, as shaped and carried out by language, these desires, feelings, thoughts, wants and needs are always both simultaneously in excess and lack in relation to the words that express and carry them out. These words were not made for our feelings and our feelings alone. They're a one size fits all R$15,00 legging that can only stretch so far, or only holds up from a certain size up. So, we keep symbolizing, we keep talking and explaining, and trying to make sense of something we ourselves don't have the words to understand. We keep trying to fit our feelings, wants and needs, in molds that are not necessarily fit for them[18]. In Ryan Murphy's hit TV series Glee there is a piece of dialogue in season one, episode twenty, when Lea Michelle and Idina Menzel's characters – respectively, Rachel Berry and Shelby Corcoran – are having a dramatic conversation about Shelby's "what ifs", whether or not she regretted having given up Rachel to adoption, and whether or not she resented not having a big break and reaching fame. Halfway through the scene Shelby asks how does Rachel feel, and she answers "Thirsty. When I was little and I used to get sad, my dads would bring me a glass of water. It got so I couldn't tell if I

[18] Here, the mental image I have is something similar to trying to use many different-shaped cookie cutters in many different, irregular oddly-shaped pieces of dough. We can try to cut the dough to get the perfect shape of the mold in the cookie cutter, but, since the shapes are so irregular, there's always going to be *some* dough left out of the mold, and some part of the mold that wasn't able to be filled with enough dough, so the shape is not perfectly complete. That for me is desire.

was sad or just thirsty" (MURPHY, 2010). I feel like this line partially illustrates the play between desire and the symbolic, the feelings, affects, emotions, and the words we are capable of putting them into. And also how much more complex and entangle this tapestry of signifiers can become, as to not have "sadness" without "thirst"[19].

> "Desire crosses the signifying line, and what does it encounter at the level at which it crosses the signifier line? It encounters the Other. (…) I am not saying it encounters the Other as a person. It encounters it as the treasure trove of signifiers, as the locus of the code. This is where the refraction of desire by the signifier occurs. Desire, then, as the signified, is different when it arrives from what it was at the start, and there you have" (LACAN, 2017, p. 134).

This "something left/something lacking" is what we know as the real. Something which cannot be symbolized, which stays out of the realm of the symbolic or of symbolization. The relation with symbolization and the real I have is that feeling you have that you can never fully explain something, and then you just go on and on and on, and you never do get to the point where you're satisfied, and feel like you've been able to come across clearly.

The process of subject formation in relation to an Other is addressed more particularly in Lacan's piece on the mirror stage, in which he narrates the process through which a child is able to recognize themself in the mirror – as something apart from their mother – and had, first, the jubilant feeling of seeing their wholeness projected on to the reflecting surface; second, disappointment upon realizing a disconnection with the image of a whole complete individual they see in the mirror, and the lack of dexterity they have in the movement of their body and limbs; and, third, as they hear their mother saying "look at the baby", and such things, they constitute the relation with the ideal ego the subject will then go on to pursue and aspire to become. This moment in which the child feels a disconnect between their image in the mirror and their own lived experience of inhabiting its own body, and, nevertheless, they see

[19] Here I want to carefully distinguish my interpretation from the kind of Ego psychology Lacan argued against and wanted to distance himself from, which might take this line as "See? You can rewire your brain as to not feel sad ever again, and trick yourself into thinking you're just thirsty." I do not care for these kinds of theories and – although I have and do not desire to have clinical experience other than on the talking side of the couch – feel they cause more harm them god by not addressing the patient's issues.

themself through the eyes of their mother, is a fundamental moment through which the child recognizes themself through this sort of misrecognition [*un méconnaître essentiel au me connaître*]. Those are parts of the inherent disconnection through which we emerge, fractured and split, open.

### 3. 1. 3. The Three Moments of the Oedipus Complex

This (mis)recognition in and through the Other – the mOther – doesn't seem to be enough

> "(…) for this dimension of the Other to be fully able to exercise its function as Other, as the locus of the depot of treasure trove of signifiers, it must include the following, which is that it also contain the signifier of the Other as Other. The Other also has, beyond itself, this Other capable of giving law its foundation" (LACAN, 2017, p. 141).

This support from which the (m)Other is able to derive her function as the Other, to be able to provide the subject access to the realm of the symbolic and its signifiers is what Lacan call the Name-of-the-Father: the support of the law in and for the Other – in the Other, for the subject.

> "This is what I call the Name-of-the-Father, namely the symbolic father. It's a term that subsists at the level of signifiers and that, in the Other, as the seat of the law, represents the Other. This is the signifiers that gives the law its support, that promulgates the law. It is the Other in the Other" (LACAN, 2017, p. 132).

This is where we begin to travel back and forth to Lacan's understandings of the language-like structures of the unconscious, and his deep belief – following Freud – that psychoanalytical theory must be strongly grounded – and it is in fact solely dependent – on clinical practice and experience. That I why, I believe, in this section, we will go back and forth from the structures of chains of signifiers and language and the roles of father, mother and child.

"The father" in this symbolic structure Lacan sets up, "is a metaphor" (LACAN, 2017, p. 158), his "function in the Oedipus complex is to be a signifier substituted for the signifier introduced into symbolization, the maternal signifier" (LACAN, 2017, p. 159). This is, of course, pertaining to the structure I have just recalled in the last sub-section, in which the mother has played an essential role in the constitution of the child's primordial symbolization. In this relation, then, the father, as a metaphor, must slide and substitute the mother as a signifier. From him, then, must be derived all the authority, order meaning and law. He must take the place of support of signification.

> "Through this symbolization, the child detaches its effective dependence on the mother's desire from the pure and simple lived experience of this dependence, and something that is subjectivized at an initial or primitive level is instituted. This subjectification consists simply in posing the mother as this primordial being who may be there or not. In the child's own desire this being is essential. What does the subject desire? It's not simply a matter of appetition for the mother's care, contact or even presence, but appetition for her desire" (LACAN, 2017, p. 165-166).

We can interpret this move as a very significant one, as the move from private to public in a subject's life. It is the moment in which the subject emerges as such. The moment they leave behind the private realm of the nursery and their primal connection and dependence of their mother, to realize there is a world far wider than what they have experienced out there. And this world belongs to the father.

Lacan narrates this process in the "The Three Moments of the Oedipus Complex" which: first, the father is referenced to as the authority, and as supporter of the symbolic and the law, but remains concealed; second, the moment in which "the father affirms himself in his private presence, insofar as he is the one who supports the law" (LACAN, 2017, p. 178); and, third, the moment in which the father is revealed, or reveals himself, as the one who has the phallus. This second moment is regarded as an important moment when the child feels castrated, and the third is regarded as the resolution of the Oedipus complex, when the child identifies himself – and now we start gendering our pronouns regarding psychoanalytical theory's subject formation as well – with the father "in a dialectic that remains very ambiguous between love and identification, identification as rooted in love" (LACAN, 2017, p. 154). The child

identifies himself the father not exactly as “the one having it”, but as having it – it being the phallus, and here Lacan goes back and forth with the idea of the phallus being an empty signifier of the desire of the mother, and the actual penis (insofar as the being identified as “boy” is said to have it, and the being identified as “girl” is said to lack it) – for later.

This, of course, is only the broader overview of the process. Let’s break it down into smaller bits. Here I want to be honest with my struggle of understanding these “three moments” as a purely pedagogical tool for us to understand symbolization and its impossibilities not as a recurrent and continued process throughout our whole lives, and an actual decisive and constitutive moment in our development as children that decides whether we get to go on as “normal” neurotic subjects, or if we fall into the abyss of psychotic lack of ability to symbolize. Again, Butler’s (2004) work on the inevitability of failing to conform and achieve a norm’s ideal seems to be the most prolific path through which to think subjectivity and subject formation here.

In a first moment, the child and the mother enjoy a relationship in which in a postpartum bubble of love and nourishment, where they feel safe and whole in their relationship with their mother. But quickly the child realizes 1. them and their mother are not one, and the whole image they see in the mirror doesn’t match the lived experience of little coordination over its own body; 2. the mother’s desire is not fully theirs. The mother has other interests, and other objects of desire: mainly, the father. In fact, the “law of the father” seems to rule this little universe. The father seems to have control over the “comings and goings” of the mother, and she seems to be subject to him, his law and will. This is how the child first comes to know the father: as an ominous presence, that yet, doesn’t seem to show itself.

In the second moment “[i]t is no longer in the comings and goings of the mother that he is present and therefore still halfveiled, but he appears in his own discourse. In some ways, the father’s message becomes the mother’s message insofar as he now permits and authorized” (LACAN, 2017, p. 189). This is the moment when the child realizes this something responsible for the mother’s “comings and goings” is not only

responsible for that, but for the law. That is when they realize the father is an ordering principle in that little universe, that the father functions as law. I see this moment very clearly as the moment of the "just wait when your father gets home" or "because your father said so", we often hear growing up, which has always been, for me, a recognition of one's lack of authority, or maybe even a performative speech act through which one gives up their authority to the one being referred to – the one to which the power seems to be deferred to – in the sentence. This speech act – however it is phrased – seems to be a crucial performance in the Oedipus complex regarding the affirmation of the mother as an empty vessel through which the father's authority flows.

The third moment, for me, finally, is the moment when Lacan's "comings and goings" between structures and signifiers and phalluses, fathers, mothers, children and penises seem to blurry the lines between structural and "actual" and leave a trace of later in the first.

Let's not forget the traumatic aspect of this whole process for the child. This is a process through which they realize not only that the being they once thought as being whole with themself as not only not a part of them, but in fact as having their desire directed towards something – or someone – else; but in which they lose all the grounding on which they thought symbolization stood. This is a moment in which the child realizes the treasure trove of signifiers is not their mOther, but something else beyond her. "The father testified that he was giving the phallus insofar as, and only insofar as, he is the bearer, or the supporter, if I may put it like that, of the law. He can give or he can refuse to give, insofar as he has the phallus, but he must give proof that he has it" (LACAN, 2017, p. 177). And so, the father reveals himself as having it. It, being the phallus. In that moment in which the father reveals himself as having the phallus, he, concomitantly and automatically reveals himself as being the supporter of the law, the treasure trove of signifiers, the one which holds the desire of the mother – it all seems to be bundled up together, and coming as part of the same job. At that moment, the child is able to identify itself with the father – insofar as the father is revealed as loved, as having the object of the mOther's desire –, and have his penis – or "the entitlements for being a man" (LACAN, 2017, p. 179) – for later, avoiding

psychosis or perversion. “At the third moment, then, the father intervenes as real and potent. (…) It’s insofar as the father intervenes as the one who has it that he is internalized in the subject as ego-ideal and that, henceforth, let’s not forget, the Oedipus complex declines” (LACAN, 2017, p. 178)

### 3. 1. 4. Authority

One of the first things that caught my eyes and sparked my curiosity in social contract theory was the debate on authorship and authority. How could it be that by exercising his own authorship and signing the social contract, the subject was willingly giving up his “right to all things”, and limiting his authority and power? In this subsection, I want to invite for a second reading of the moment of “giving up” of authority through authorship in Hobbes’s social contract. Here I hope to keep in mind what we have already been able to observe in my previous chapter, in the relationship between neurosis and social contract, as we now see the neurotic subject, in what we now know to be Lacan’s understanding of his emergence through paternalistic structures, in order to become a subject. My hope here is that through analyzing the paternalistic aspects of this emergence and how, through it, the ambiguous relationship between subject/child and father becomes one permeated by fear and “identification as rooted in love” (LACAN, 2017, p. 154), we can be able to better understand these psychic attachments in the social contract subject as well.

Here I want to take us back to the chapters in Hobbes where he discusses both Persons, Authors, and things Personated and the Naturall Lawes and Contracts in which these persons could find themselves as parts of. Now, “a person”, according to Hobbes, “is he whose words or actions are considered either as his own, or as representing the words and actions of an other man” (HOBBES, 1997, p. 88). By these qualities, then, Hobbes characterizes this person who owns his own – or other man’s – words as an “Author” in a relationship in which “the person is the Actor; and he that owneth his words and actions, is the AUTHOR: In which case the Actor acted by Authority” (HOBBES, 1997, p. 89).

This, for me, might be the most important discussion, insofar as it draws the boundaries between who gets to be a subject and who doesn't. Hobbes, as praised as he is for not crystalizing inequalities of gender in his work, unlike many other contractualists, misses the already up and running structure of inequality between not only men and women, but as straight people and LGBT people, white people and people of color, able bodied people and disabled people, and so on. As I have said in my last chapter, subjects were thought of as men, breadwinners for their households, husbands to their wives, and father to their children, and even master to their slaves. And only these particular people: well-off white heterosexual men, were granted subjecthood. These people own(ed) their own persons, their words and their actions. And they got to be called out by their names. As Nancy Luxon puts it:

> "The language o 'authorship' becomes appealing for its ability to sidestep these impasses, to return to the initial paradox binding liberty and authority, and to hold this paradox central to democratic political practice. By turning to 'authority', then, I seek neither to resolve the paradox nor to revalorize it, but to open new conceptual space. I suggest that the practices of freedom most often associated with contemporary politics also imply practice of authorship. If, to borrow Foucault's apposite phrase, contemporary politics seeks 'not to be governed like that, by that, in the name of those principles', then one dimension of any response must be to alter the term of authority: to ask, under what conditions to individual author their actions, constrained by which hierarchies, and interpreted in reference to which ideals?" (LUXON, 2013, p. 22-23).

And here is where I found the discussion around the Name-of-the-Father particularly pertinent to the issue of subjecthood in the social contract. That the name of the father – not father, not him himself or his actual physical presence, as Lacan puts, it, but just his name – is hold out as the Law, and the ordaining principle of the Symbolic: the subject's entire access to language and sociability, tells us something about subjecthood and names. Carole Pateman (1988) also seemed to think so, as she wrote:

> "To be a slave or a wife was, so to speak, to be in a perpetual nonage that wives have not yet entirely cast off. Adult male slaves were called 'boys' and adult married women were – and still are – called 'girls'. As befitted civilly dead beings, the slave was brought to life by being given a name by its master (servants were also given

> another name by their masters if their own was 'unsuitable'; 'Mary' was very popular). When a woman becomes a wife, her status was/is singled out by the title 'Mrs'. A wife was included under her husband's name and, still today, can be called 'Mrs John Smith' (PATEMAN, 1988, p. 121).

To be a woman or a slave is to be no one. It is to go from 'Miss Mary Smith' to 'Mrs. James Johnson' without so much as a mention to oneself. It is to go from the protection from one's father and his law, to the protection and law of a husband. Here, I won't be so bold as to discuss the racial issues Pateman presents – and Charles Mills (1997) further develops and stunningly argues in his Racial Contract – as I do not want to mesh together three distinctively complex issues such as race and gender and sexuality. I will present more fully concerns on (not) addressing race in the scope of this dissertation on my next chapter.

In the scope of this dissertation I want to explore the psychic aspect of this exclusion – that Butler might call inclusion by exclusion, inclusion as abject, as other – of the status of subject, as well as how the process through which one becomes a subject might involve a particular psychic investment in authority[20]. Here I want to explore further this process which shapes the relationship between the father and child as one regulated by the fear of castration, and this identification/love the child has for their father. And maybe then understand this psychic investment the social contract subject might have both in their fear and identification/love for authority. Or, as Vladimir Safatle (2016) might put it, a relationship of both hope and fear. Safatle, just as Charles Tilly (1985) and David Campbell (1992) reads the state as a precarious fiction whose continuous acts of violence targeting difference not only outside, but inside. This performative violence occurs in the waging of wars, military exercises and patrolling of borders, but it also happens inside, in practices of exclusion, othering and even extermination of minorities that do not conform to the homogenous fiction of the state. This is a process, Butler narrates, as one in which

[20] Here I want to differentiate myself – and I will expand on this by the end of this subsection – from the analysis of psychic or otherwise investment in authority such as the ones made by Weber (2004) or Freud (2001). My aim here is to ask about the subject's "particular psychic investment in authority", not the subject's "psychic investment in particular types of authorities".

> "a faction sets itself up as the universal and claims to represent the general will, where the general will supersedes the individual wills of which it is composed and, in fact, exists at their expense. The 'will' that is officially represented by the government is thus haunted by a 'will' that is excluded from the representative function. Thus the government is established on the basis of a paranoid economy in which it must repeatedly establish its one claim to universality by erasing all remnants of those wills it excludes from the domain of representation. Those wills are not officially represented or recognized constitute 'an unreal pure will' (para. 591), and since that will is not known, it is incessantly conjectured and suspected. In an apparently paranoid fit, universality thus displays and enacts the violent separations of its own founding. Absolute freedom becomes this abstract self-consciousness which understands annihilation to be its workd, and effaces (annihitales) all trace of the alterity that clings to it" (BUTLER,; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 22)

Here, then, is where I hope I have caught up with Charlotte Epstein's (2013) in her argument for a reading of the Leviathan as the Symbolic. Epstein, as I already have mentioned, in her 2013 paper on Agency in the discipline of IR, takes the models of agency she identifies in the discipline: the "rational actor" and the "constructivist self", and argues for a third, more productive model: a lacanian "split speaking subject". But not before making a compelling argument which gives us insights on how Hobbes's political giant might be read as Lacan's register of the Symbolic. Throughout this whole dissertation I rely heavily on Epstein's insight on the "Hobbesian narrative" as "one of entry into socialization" (EPSTEIN, 2013, p. 302), and her argument for interpreting the Leviathan as a quilting point, "an open-ended signifier that necessarily eludes all attempts to pin it down to a set of signifieds, because it operates as the master signifier that designates the Symbolic at large" (EPSTEIN, 2013, p. 304). This largely informs all my argument around the Leviathan laying out a network of language through which all politics could then operate.

This is where I find investment in paternal authority in the social contract subject: in his ambiguous relation of fear and love/admiration with authority; in his constant and obsessive addressment to authority; in the paranoid security culture authorities develop trying to keep their authority; in the centrality of fatherly figures in our political order, in his law and will; and even in our equating government with housekeeping at times, butchering macroeconomics, arguing for cuts in national

budgets as if they were home budgets. I find our investment in paternal authority first and foremost in the child-like positions we take as subjects: we delegate and then forget about it. As if our representational system was just about voting, and we didn't made politics happen everyday.

I feared this particular section would too much focus on authority as held by one specific person with specific personality traits or types of rule, as Max Weber (2004) seems to focus on his essay *Politics as a Vocation* and Freud, in his *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (2001). What concerns me the most, not just in the limits of this dissertation, but more broadly, is not what particularly charismatic or in any other way singular people can do. In this instance, I would rather interpret the Holocaust not as the workings of the particular malevolent mind of one Adolf Hitler, but as modernity at its finest, carrying out all the destruction of difference it has been built for. But I am happy to be emerging from it with the impression that the connections I established with Nancy Luxon, Carole Pateman, Vladimir Safatle, Judith Butler and Charlotte Epstein have pulled me through a muddy ground on which I could easily have slipped into analyzing personalities and decision making of world leaders, and have been able to make a well-informed analysis about the structure through which we emerge as subjects and our affects invested on it.

Here is where I wish I was able to say *Voilá!* There you have it: how the subject works, how his attachments and investments in paternal authority work in our psycho-political processes of formation. But it has never been about that, has it? Because there is no "subject" that "works" in a certain way, only subjects, who time and again fail to "work" and emerge as fully fledged subjects in our politico-symbolic structure. And maybe here is where Butler's (2004) work on norms seems to come at handy in dealing with the disappointment of (not) having figured "it" out, not having come out with the blueprints for the subjected and not having cracked the code to our political investments. She explains the process of subject formation in relation to a norm the subject can only aspire and try its best to achieve, but which it must only fail and fall short. And it is precisely this failure what keeps the process going, keeps the subject invested in the norm. It is only because I cannot ever understand "how stuff works"

that I keep trying, that I apply for a phD, that I go on into my academic career and hope to share all these ways of seeing the world with my peers and students.

And it's not to say that all this work has been in vain, or that there's not a connection between our psychic processes of attachment to paternal authority. Indeed, what I wish to explore further in the next section is precisely the particular role the "father" – I'm tempted to say "whatever that is", but, at the same time it does seem to be the real actual human being who fulfills the role of father in a family – plays at the Oedipal complex/drama.

In order for an individual, a masculine individual – let's not forget – to emerge as a subject from the Oedipus complex, the role of the father does seem to have to be of a restricting and stern father. This father figure reminds me and seems much like a sociably acceptable version of the father from the primal horde. It is with this strict, authoritarian, absent father, that the child must identify, after that he might castrate him. An identification as rooted in love, as the Oedipus complex dictates. And when he comes of age, Carole Pateman (1988) reminds us, this once little boy must establish himself as the paternal authority in his own home, through the Sexual Contract, and join his brothers in a fraternally equal society[21]. Here I join Pateman's stand – not comfortably – on our society as fraternal. But, instead of using the formulation "fraternal, rather than patriarchal", I might say "fraternal, rooted in patriarchalism". This, because Pateman herself affirms that it is only through the Sexual Contract, and only establishing dominance over one's own home, that one can meet his brother and enjoy a fraternal equality.



## 3. 2. Penis and Phallus: "Historicism" and "Formalism"

[21] "It's insofar as the father is loved that the subject identifies with him and discovers the final solution to the Oedipus complex, in a composite of amnesic repression and the acquisition within himself of this ideal term owing to which he becomes the father" (LACAN, 2017, p. 155).

There is a moment, for me, in lacanian psychoanalytical theory when phallus and penis, desire, mother and father begin to blurry the lines between structural and "actual", and the "distinction (…) between the Name-of-the-father and the real father" (LACAN, 2017, p. 141) begins to fade. This is a moment when Lacan's "comings and goings" between the two "levels' – if we are to follow Žižek's argument about the abstract and structural character of the Oedipus complex in opposition to Butler's alleged "historicism" – when I suspect of something else going on, something beyond pure structure. And here I am afraid – as an expression, but in fact not afraid at all – my alignment with Butler's interpretation and overall argument will once again be clear, as I hope to end this dissertation with her critique on the limits of intelligibility for Žižek's – here as a placeholder for the entire "structuralist" "side" on this debate – understanding of subject formation.

Here, Lacan blurs the lines, affirming the father both as real, as a structural position in the subject's formation, and as real insofar as "the institutions confer upon him" (LACAN, 2017, p. 164) his place in said structure.

> "The father, for us, he is real. But let's not forget that he is only real for us insofar as the institutions confer upon him. I am not even going to say his role as a father – it's not a sociological question – but his name as a father. That the father is, for example, the real agent of procreation is in no case a truth of experience" (LACAN, 2017, p. 164).

Meaning: the Name-of-the-Father is not necessarily a male presenting human being, with a penis, married to a female presenting human being, which has birthed a child through her vagina – or through a cut in her stomach in a c section – after having implanted in her an embryo formed by her egg and his sperm. It means that the Name-of-the-Father is anything which captures child's primary caregiver – this being to whom the child had their first connection and whose life revolves around – desire. Lacan presents us through diagrams and formulas this structuring positioning in which, as many argue, anyone or anything can occupy.

And here we could try a number or different narratives, in which the mother is invested in her job instead in the father – absent or not –; we could try keeping a

heterosexual couple, but switching the gender roles, having the female presenting person occupy the position of "father" and the male presenting person occupy the position of father; we could try same sex parents occupying a large array of gender roles; the same as trans parents. But every time we seem to fall anywhere other than the traditional cis-heteronormative monogamous bourgeois nuclear family, something seems to "go wrong".

These narrative are all impossible for a structure such as the Oedipus complex because – as reluctant most psychoanalytical theorists are to admit that – the Oedipal structure is historically and geographically specific to the moments it has been conceived. The Oedipus complex depends of a heterosexual cisgender monogamous bourgeois nuclear family in order to go smoothly and have the subject reach its resolution. The mother has to necessarily be a housewife, whose only purpose in life is to take care of her husband's home – her husband's, not hers, and this will carry on in her bond with the baby, in which he will be put in the place of "his majesty, the baby", but will also, later on, compete for the mother's attention with the center of said household's universe: the father –, and be hopelessly devoted to him – in order for him to be the object of her desire, in order for him to have the phallus. The father has to be as uninvolved as possible with domestic affairs – in order to appear, in the first moment of the Oedipus complex as not a real person, but as the reason for the mother's comings and goings –, and, at the same time, be the law and will which, invisibly controls everything in that household – for the mother to be recognized as not able to provide the structure for the child's symbolic order, this ability, and place of the support of the signifiers, and the law, must be the father's. And that this model of family structure be reproduced through the Oedipus complex seems to be of utmost importance, in its normative character.

> "What matters is the function in which three things intervene – first, the Name-of-the-Father, second, the father's spoken words, the third, the law insofar as the father has more or less intimate relationship to it. What is essential is that the mother establish the father as the mediator of what lies beyond her law and her capriciousness" (LACAN, 2017, p. 174)

What matters most, then, is that the mother give up all of her will and agency and control over anything the child perceives as important, so the father can show himself as real and potent. I hope to explore this point further in my next chapter.

And here is where I want to situate myself in the whole "structuralists" versus "historicists" debate in Lacanian psychoanalytical theory – which I have Žižek and Butler as parameters for each 'side'. In this debate, so called "structuralists" argue that the Oedipus complex and all other lacanian devices, following Lacan's strong grounding on saussurean linguistics, is hollowed out. For structuralists, the Oedipus complex is a quasi-transcendental structure which we go through in order to become subjects. And anyone may occupy any position on this structure. What matters here is structure, not content. This means "mother" and "father" are mere positions in a structure, to be filled out by anyone who sees fit. The so called "structuralists" evade questions on the heteronormativity and reification of traditional gender roles in the Oedipus drama simply by arguing that these are purely formal, hollowed out structures, who could be filled by any one: a gay or lesbian couple, or a heterosexual couple who doesn't follow to the letter the gender binary. On the other hand, the so called "historicists" argue that not such hollowed out structure can exist without carrying some of the content on which it was based. The so called "historicists" hold on firmly to the function of the symbolic, as a social realm, as much as linguistic, and argue for the contextually based structure of the heteronormative bourgeois family in which Freud and Lacan develop their theories on the unconscious. Here, "whoever sees fit" doesn't quite work, because heteronormativity continues to be at work. A gay or lesbian couple still would need to have a "feminine" and "masculine" figure in order to "fit" the mold of the Oedipal drama. Which would defeat the whole purpose of being in a homosexual relationship, because the parts would still be playing heterosexual roles.

Although I might guess that my position in the debate between "structuralists" and "historicists" seems quite obvious, I still want to state my issues within the debate and highlight two moves I identify in lacanian psychoanalytical subject formation theory that seem to bother me most, which are: first, reinforcing gender roles through the structure of the heteronormative cisgender biparental bourgeois nuclear family;

and, second, conflating gender, sex and sexuality. In this second half of my subsection on this debate, I will try to highlight, as I mention, my difficulties with Lacan's "comings and goings" between the more structuralist position on this debate to a more historicist. My claim here is one that follows Judith Butler (LACLAU; ŽIŽEK, 2000) on pointing out that structures always are left with a trace of the content they were built around[22]. And the particular structure through which Lacan seems to understand subject formation seems to take sexual difference as its limits. This leaves us with two terrifying consequences: 1. only heterosexual cisgender people are recognized as subjects, and the political structure is defined on the basis of this subject and this subject only – which I have mentioned in my brief engagement with Charles Mills and Carole Pateman's Racial and Sexual Contract, respectively –; but, worst of all 2. that this setting of sexual difference as the limits of intelligibility and anyone who dares to defy or not conform with this norm gets cast to abjection, but that this limit is taken as structural, a-historical, a-social and uncontestable.

These two points seem to be concomitant as the discussion on more material aspects of the Oedipus complex, such as equating the phallus with the penis at times, and requiring that subjects take the characteristic of "viril" and "passive" – or "feminine" –, depending on their gender identification and/or genitalia/chromosome configuration – which Lacan seems to conflate. He seems to hold the parents to strictly stereotypical heteronormative gender roles. And so the children follow, taking "virility" and "the penis for later" or "passivity", and "know[ing] where to find the phallus with the father and, later, with the husband", according to whether they had, respectively, a penis or a vagina, on a heavily biologizing narrative of sexual difference, or differencing. Here we can see at play, in the resolution of the Oedipus complex for the boy and the girls the reinforcement of gender roles present in the heteronormative

[22] Again, the mental image I have for this debate is a scaffolding built around some construction. It is an empty structure, empty as a signifier, it can take the form of any building it is put together around, anything can slide into it, and fill it with meaning. But the thing is: it takes the form of the building is its put together around. Here, content shapes form, and once it takes the form of the building, you can tear the building down, but the only thing that will be able to fully fit in that structure is something with exactly the same size and shape – coming around to, now, form shaping content. The mold for understanding the unconscious was built around the cis-heteronormative bourgeois family. Nothing other than that will fit the mold. And that's when the Oedipal complex becomes normative. Form, as empty as it may seem, shapes content here.

cisgender bourgeois nuclear families Freud and Lacan seem to have built their clinical experience around. Which takes us one step further understanding the social construction and indeed, the performativity not only of gender but also sex (BUTLER, 1993).

> "What is at issue in the castration is never articulated and is made almost completely mysterious. We know, however the following two facts depend on it – that on one side, the boy becomes a man, that on the other side the girl becomes a woman. In both cases, the question of having is settled by the intermediary of the castration complex – even for him who in the end has the penis by right, that is, the male. This presupposes that, in order to have it, there must have been a time at which he didn't have it" (LACAN, 2017, p. 170)

On the one side, Lacan keeps himself "at the structural level", theorizing around the phallus as abstract, as it "occupies such a central place as an object in the Freudian economy" (LACAN, 2017, p. 144). He not only presents the phallus position as the object of the mother's desire, so that "[t]he child establishes a relationship to the phallus insofar as it is the object of the mother's desire" (LACAN, 2017, p. 168), but as a structural position. The definition seems to be retroactive: anything that holds the mother's desire automatically becomes the phallus, and anyone identified as having the phallus can exert the authority of Name-of-the-Father. The father only has the phallus, only holds the object of the mother's desire, as long as she actually shows desire from him; and the father only takes the position of the Name-of-the-Father, as long as our social institutions and norm authorize him as such. "The father is in metaphorical position inasmuch as, and solely to the extent that, the mother makes him the one who, by his presence, sanctions the existence as such of the locus of the law" (LACAN, 2017, p. 180). This seems to be the "distinction (…) between the Name-of-the-Father and the real father" (LACAN, 2017, p. 141), that the "real", or "actual" father occupies a certain place in the biological "making" of the subject, or that he occupies a certain place in the child's rearing and (psychic) life.

That's where Lacan seems to play between the more abstract and the more concrete instances in his theory. "The father, for us, he is real. But let's not forget that he is only real for us insofar as the institutions confer upon him, I am not even going

to say his role and function as father – it's not a sociological question – but his name as a father. That the father is, for example, the real agent of procreation is in no case a truth of experience" (LACAN, 2017, p. 164). The place of phallus or Name-of-the-Father are taken as purely structural, insofar as the place they hold on the Oedipal structure. "[T]he phallus as the pivot of the entire subjective dialectic. It is the phallus insofar as it is desired by the mother. (…) if our reference points are always stable and certain, it's because they are structural and because they are linked to the pathways of signifying constructions" (LACAN, 2017, p. 183). On the other side, this "real" father seems do assume certain social and even biological attributes when Lacan mentions things such as "[p]otency in the genital sense" (p. 177) – whatever that is. And when he makes reference to Freud's work, who situates the fear of castration – as we have been able to see in little Árpád's fear of having the chicken bit out his penis, and in little Hans's fear of the horses. "On the contrary, it is at the genital level that Freud's teachings, and the teaching that maintains it, situates castration as a gap" (LACAN, 1987, P. 67).

Castration, here, seems to take a much more literal sense then Lacan usually keeps his theories at. And this literal, physical "real" – as he calls it – interpretation is the one Lacan seems to hold as he differentiates the resolution of the Oedipus complex for boys than its resolution for girls. These questions, for me, don't seem to occupy the place of "simply structural", but to carry out very much concrete undertones. That is what I want to address in the cisheteronormative – and, at times, phallocentric and misogynistic – structure of the Oedipus complex, and Lacan's later understanding of it. Throughout my last chapter, I want to argue these are not simply formal and structural positions because they were conceived in a specific historical and geographical time and place. This time and place had its specific culture, and that was all these men had to draw from in terms of "normal". But to take a historically and geographically specific statistical "normal" and to theorize it as the norm, not is a huge step that should not be taken lightly.

In the "Three Moments of the Oedipus Complex", we followed the Oedipus drama as it unfolds for boys/men, as they seem to be taken as the standard subject, and

women as a deviation from that norm – in the world in general, as well as in psychoanalytical theory, and we were able to perceive its resolution as one in which the child perceives/sees the father as having it – "it" being the phallus, the object of the mother's desire, the support of the symbolic and the law in that universe. Through this process they enter a stage of "identification as rooted in love" (LACAN, 2017, p. 154). "The outcome of the Oedipus complex is, as everyone knows, different for the woman. (…) She does not have to carry out this identification nor retain this title to virility. She knows where it is, and she knows where she has to get it. It's on the side of the father and she goes to him as having it" (LACAN, 2017, p. 179). Here is where biology seems to take center stage at Lacan's theory. Because the only reason boys would identify themselves with the father as "having it" – or "having it for later", as he puts it – and girls as "not having it" and not even having to have it is purely based on the difference of the genitals we identify as "girls" and "boys" possessing. "It's to the extent that the father becomes her ego-ideal that the girl's recognition that she doesn't have the phallus occurs. But this is good for her – whereas for the boy it would be an absolutely disastrous outcome, as sometimes it is" (LACAN, 2017, p. 157)[23].



## 3. 3. Heterosexual Matrix

And here lays the heart of the question: "the Oedipus complex has an essentially normalizing function" (LACAN, 2017, p. 145). The Oedipus is not a mere story created to describe how psychoanalysis understands subject formation, but a normative theory of subject formation, which carries a gender and sexual normatization of bodies in the sex and gendering, and assuming different positions not only in relation to "the phallus" or "desire", but in society, in their relation to authority and the law in general. "at the

[23] The "ego-ideal being': "[t]he ego-ideal is the signifier operating as ideal, an internalized plan of the law, the guide governing the subject's position in the symbolic order, and hence anticipates secondary (Oedipal) identification (S1, 141) or is a product of that identification (Lacan, 1957–8)" (EVANS, 1996, p. 53), or, put in another way, "an agency of the personality resulting from the coming together of narcissism (idealisation of the ego) and identification with the parents, with their substitutes or with collective ideals. As a distinct agency, the ego-ideal constitutes a model to which the subject attempts to conform" (LAPLANCHE; PONTALIS, 1973, 44).

time of the normativizing outcome of the Oedipus complex, the child recognizes not having - not truly having what he has, in the case of the boy, and what she doesn't have, in the case of the girl" (LACAN, 2017, p. 158). The problem with which I take issue here is, obviously, the reification not only of gender roles according to the already mentioned biologizing narrative of sex, but also the reiteration of the gender binary. Here, Freud and Lacan not only describe said gender roles, but prescribe how boys and girls should emerge as such in the resolution of the Oedipus complex, recognizing themselves as essentially different and assume the proper gender roles according said identification. Not to mention their inability to recognize the existence of people not fitting the "typical binary notions of male or female bodies" (UNFE, 2018, p. 1)[24], leading to a complete erasure and pathologization of non-binary and intersex people.

Throughout much of his lessons on The Logic of Castration, as I will try to argue in my next chapter, Lacan conflates notions of sex, gender and sexuality, contributing to stereotypes of gay men as feminine flamboyant figures women as passive and overall "lacking"[25]. As I have argued before here, Lacan's leaning into stereotypes and caricatures, not only of gay men, but of heterosexual men and women, furthers in homophobia and misogyny. The homophobia and misogyny Lacan furthers in his theory, I will try to argue on my last chapter, is not a mere old fashion vocabulary on gender and sexuality. And even if it were a question of vocabulary, I think I have said enough about the linguistic structuring of reality to take vocabulary questions lightly. Lacan has a rather homophobic and misogynistic understanding of the positions each character should occupy in the Oedipal drama, and which resolutions are satisfactory or unsatisfactory. And this, I believe, as a theorization and understanding of the world we live in, shapes it and furthers in this homophobia and misogyny. The strict molds not only the children who undergo the Oedipus complex in order to become subjects, but also of their families prescribed by Lacan's theory only contributes to

[24] Which is quite significant if we take recent research that shows "between 0.05% and 1.7% of the population is born with intersex traits – the upper estimate is similar to the number of red haired people" (UNFE, 2018, p. 1).

[25] "This is also indicative of the respect in which femininity, true femininity, always has a bit of a dimension of escape. True women always have something a little lost about them" (LACAN, 2017, p. 179).

conservative narratives of what “family” means, and cause more harm than good, as we can see in Judith Butler’s (1993) illustration of the conflation between “structural” and “real” in the Oedipus complex through the discussion of adoption by same sex couples in France.

In his interpretation of subject formation through the Oedipus complex – as it was first laid out by Freud – Lacan not only does genitalia is taken as indicative of somebody’s sex, but it is also conflated with the gender roles they are supposed to assume in order for the subject undergo the necessary interventions the Oedipus complex brings about and for it to produce subjects that show the correct psychic configurations for “I won’t say perversions, but in neurosis and in the entire course, even the easiest and most normal of the Oedipus complex” (LACAN, 2017, p. 168). And in my next chapter instead of going on pointing fingers and calling out Lacan’s homophobia, transphobia and misogyny, I want to think the normalizing character the Oedipus complex, as Lacan himself tells us, has, and what kinds of subjects and political relations it produces and endorses.

# 4. The Limits of Intelligibility: Cisheteronormativity in the Oedipus Complex

Form shapes content; content informs form. Like water takes the shape of the container it is poured into, so can sugar, butter and flour – among a few other ingredients – be mixed together and baked into a delicious cake. "The subject" is the foundation upon which we can built "the political", and some sort of political is crucial for the subject to emerge and exist as such. We get to understand politics, then, as I have been trying to engage throughout my dissertation, as a practice of drawing, negotiating and contesting the limits of who shapes, as a subject, "the political". This struggle, the struggle for subjecthood, I believe happens at the limits between "subject" and "political" – and this might be the most important point of my whole dissertation –: subjectivity. This is why I have chosen to engage with, as much as have been led to Butler's (2000, 1993) argument of sexuality as the limits of lacanian subject formation and her thinking through the relation between "subject" and "political" in which radical democracy[26] is the horizon.

The project for radical democracy, as I have been able to understand it, requires: 1. recognizing the conditions under which subjects emerge as such, and shape the politics they've emerged in; 2. understanding the subject's attachment and investment in those very conditions under which they have emerged; 3. understanding the possible horizons for change, what do we want it to look like, and what might be keeping us from it. The dispute here, seems to be over hegemony, as what

> "emphasizes the ways in which power operates to from our everyday understanding of social relations, and to orchestrate the ways in which we consent to (and reproduce) those tacit and covert relations

[26] I understand "radical democracy" here both as a critique to "the aggregative model of democracy, which reduces the democratic process to the expression of those interests and preferences which are registered in a vote aiming at selecting leaders who will carry out the chosen policies" (LACLAU; MOUFFE, 2001, p. xvii) and a project of constitution and reconstitution of political identities and shaping of subjects through debate in the public sphere. This project, I believe, and as far as I have been able to grasp, understands politics as "various democratic struggles against different forms of subordination. (…) sexism, racism, sexual discrimination, and in the defence of the environment" (LACLAU; MOUFFE, 2001, p. xviii).

> of power. (…) Moreover, social transformation occurs not merely by rallying mass numbers in favour of a cause, but precisely through the ways in which daily social relations are rearticulated, and new conceptual horizons opened up by anomalous or subversive practices. (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 14).

What I am trying to do here in this final section is try to understand precisely those limits for political change in the world we live in. And those limits, as I have been able to understand, lie on our investments and attachments, as subjects, in the political processes and institutions through which we emerge as such. If the way through which we understand our emergence in political life as one necessarily centered around the father and the phallus what other chance do we have of recognizing any other kind of authority, organization, or of even imagining other political horizons? The horizons for change towards a more autonomous and egalitarian political life, lay in our questioning of these conditions of emergence. If our political aspirations, if what we desire is shaped by the political vocabulary available to us[27], then what do our possibilities for change look like? If sexual difference is relegated to a structural and unchangeable abjection and othering, what chance do we have, as LGBT people, to take part in building the world we have live in, and being able to legislate over our own lives and bodies? And, aside from the liberal discussion of access to rights – which I don't want to overlook completely – if we understand sexual difference as the limit for language and sociability, to what positions are we relegated? How do understand our own existence? What chance does a project for radical democracy stand?

In this chapter, and in the context of this dissertation, I will limit myself only to the Oedipal complex's critique regarding its cis-heteronormative and somewhat phallocentric character. It has been my wish to explore further the critiques on the specific context in which Freud and Lacan theorize the emergence and formation of the subject, in its colonial and racial particularities. But I believe that for the scope of this work and with the time restrains I have at hand, I would not be able to do this critique justice, and engage into the literature as I have been able to engage with the gender and

[27] And if I have come across successfully, we've been able to understand desire as shaped by the conditions of possibility our symbolic world provides, the words and concepts we have been given to fit our wants and needs, always simultaneously lacking and in excess; and why, for me, it seemed so clear the urgency in Hobbes to lay out a political vocabulary for the modern world.

sexuality critique of psychoanalytical theory. “Leaving out” this important aspect of subject formation has been difficult for me, but I hang on to Butler’s insight that to take on the racial and post-colonial specificities of psychoanalytical theory, much more than equate gender and sexual differences with racial differences would have to be done.

> “It seems crucial to resist the model of power that would set up racism and homophobia and misogyny as parallel or analogical relations. The assertion of their abstract or structural equivalence not only misses the specific histories of their construction and elaboration, but also delays the important work of thinking through the ways in which these vectors of power require and deploy each other for the purpose of their own articulation” (BUTLER, 1993, p. 18).

To be able to engage with the particular theorizing of the racial differencing and coloniality upon which the Oedipal drama seems to be constituted, I wish I had been able to engage with authors such as Ashis Nanndy (1983), who has been able to overcome one-sided narratives of victims and perpetrators, without taking lightly the (political, social and) psychic tool coloniality has taken from both colonizers and colonized peoples, analyzing the multifaceted process of othering which, at the end, had both british and indians as victims, as british men were pushed to conform to a mold of toxic masculity and indian men were dislegitimized by being labled as “sexualy ambiguous” and “perverted”; Franz Fannon (1967) and his theorization, as a black psychiatrist, from Martinique, taking the psychic toll of living in french society as a black immigrant man; Neuza Santos Souza, and her theorization on the emergence of black subjects in Brasil as such, faced with an white ego-ideal, the self-hatred in never achieving said ideal, and the potency that comes from finding value in oneself with black militancy and social movements (SANTOS SOUZA, 1990); and, at last, but certainly not least, Lélia Gonzalez’s work theorizing “pretoguês”, a particular afro-brazilian strand of portuguese rooted in afican languages. Lélia Gonzalez shows that “pretoguês” is not a “broken-portuguese” — just as racially specific strands of english that have been cultivated in black and brown ghettos in the United States are not “broken english” — but carry the weight and honor of the ancestors and lands from which black people have been kidnapped and brought to slavery throughout the American continent (GONZALEZ; HASENBALG, 1982).

There is much in psychoanalytical theory that bothers me regarding race and coloniality. From Freud's displacement of a state of pre-sociability to totemic tribes, and the contribution this view has on a particularly eurocentric teleology of development to Lacan's use of Levi-Strauss work on structural anthropology, psychoanalytical theory has been drawing from a particular colonial literature, and psychoanalytical clinic experience – from which, let's not forget, all psychoanalytical theory necessarily comes from – seemed to rely on the experience of racially specific subjects – the ones available and open to Freud's experiments in Vienna late-1800's and early 1900's. Race and coloniality in psychoanalytical theory, I fear, have been relegated the same process we've been pointed at in Social Contract Theory by Charles Mills (1997) and International Relations Theory by Himadeep Muppidi (2012): silence and erasure. And therein lies my issue in dealing with a racially informed critique of psychoanalytical theory – even if my resistance and difficulty only contribute to that silencing and erasure –: psychoanalytical theory seems to have been built on the epistemological silencing of people of color and colonized people. In her engagement with Laclau and Žižek, Butler brings the discussion on the achievement, or the failure of, of abstraction through exclusion she takes from Hegel to a conclusion with Gayatri Chacravory Spivak's brilliant critique of the limits of colonial epistemology. But, once again, I am afraid my limitations regarding the scope of this work will leave this step to a further engagement – to which I can look forward once we are done with this work.

In this final chapter, I hope not only to present but also position myself in the literature offering critiques to certain heteronormative and misogynistic readings, and some heteronormative and misogynistic readings elements in Lacan's and Freud's theory of subject formation. This is a debate between so called "formalists" and "historicists", to which I have as parameters, respectively, Slavoj Žižek and Judith Butler. Their discussion around the possibilities for universality and the need for contingency in the project of radical democracy, and in the subject's emergence through the Oedipus complex – as I have been able to discuss in my last chapter – offer me some guidelines to said discussion and some of their arguments. I hope to bring my dissertation to a closing of sorts – after having become a bit more capable of understanding the process through which "subject" and "power" emerge in tandem –

with a critique on the limits of intelligibility in the matrix through which said subject emerges. My hope here is that, having been able to understand "the political"'s dependence on a particular understanding of the subject, questioning the exclusions through which this subject emerges might bring with it what has been excluded from said "political".

## 4. 1. Inclusions and Exclusions

In her debate on the project for radical democracy with Laclau and Žižek, Butler discusses the struggle over claims to universality residing in hegemony. Following Hegel – against Kant –, she understands the universal as being the product of the exclusion of particularities in a dynamic in which "[w]hat is universal is therefore what pertains to every person, but it is not everything that pertains to every person" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 17). And here we can imagine the Venn diagram of what pertains to every person, which will not be – and couldn't possibly be – every single characteristic of every single person, since "[u]niversality in its abstract form thus requires cutting the person off from qualities which he or she may well share with others, but which do not rise to the level of abstraction required for the term 'universality' (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 17). The process through which universality is forged, then, is one of exclusion. Exclusion of every single trait not pertaining to everyone, of every single specific trait. Butler engages with Žižek's analysis – and argument for – the building of a hegemonic universal through the exclusion of difference:

> "in the more radical sense that the very form of universality emerges through a radical dislocation, through some more radical impossibility or 'primordial repression'. The ultimate question is not which particular content hegemonizes the empty universality (and thus, in the struggle for hegemony, excludes other particular contents); the ultimate question is: which specific content has to be excluded so that the very empty form of universality emerges as the 'battlefield' for hegemony?" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 110)

The problem here for me is: we've already realized, through Pateman's (1988) and Mills's (1997), and even Butler's (1993, 1997, 2000) arguments, that subjecthood is one of those "universals" that have excluded women, people of color, children, the mentally ill, the sexually deviant, among others. Now, we must keep on asking Žižek's question: "which specific content has to be excluded so that the very empty form of universality emerges as the 'battlefield' for hegemony?".

Sticking to Butler's (1993, 2000) argument in this debate, I believe, leas us towards a questioning of the exclusion and foreclosure of sexual difference in the Oedipus work in building the universal of the political category of "the subject". The project of radical democracy to seems to have been built on the notion of openness for contestation and struggle over the hegemonic position in any given society. In radical democracy, it seems, "democratic polities are constituted through exclusions that return to haunt the polities predicated upon their absence. That haunting becomes politically effective precisely in so far as the return of the excluded forces an expansion and rearticulation of the basic premises of democracy itself" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 11).

Here is where a strictly formalist/structuralist understanding of lacanian subject formation seems too dissonant from the project of radical democracy. If sexual difference is posited as ahistorical, asocial unnegotiable condition for subject formation, there is no room for contestation of the exclusion of any subject position slightly deviating from the hetero-cisgender norm in political struggle.

> "I agree with the notion that every subject emerges on the condition of foreclosure, but do not share the conviction that these foreclosures are prior to the social, or explicable through recourse to anachronistic structuralist accounts of kinship. Whereas I believe that the Lacanian view and my own would agree on the point that such foreclosures can be considered 'internal' to the social as its founding moment of exclusion or preemption, the disagreement would emerge over whether either castration or the incest taboo can or ought to operate as the name that designates these various operations" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 140).

The incoherence between positing very substantially social and historical conditions as preconditions for subject formation in the Oedipus complex is what I wish to explore further in Butler's engagement with Laclau and, mostly, Žižek. Both Butler and Žižek seem to try to bring the debate surrounding the struggle for hegemony and claims to universality within the project for radical democracy closer to a hegelian notion of "the formal" as an exclusion of "the concrete". A notion which Butler presents highlighting the impossibility of "the concrete" not leaving traces of itself in "the formal" in which it was based. She argues,

> "formalism is itself a product of abstraction, and this abstraction requires its separation from the concrete, on that leaves the trace or remainder of this separation in the very working of abstraction itself. In other words, abstraction cannot remain rigorously abstract without exhibiting something of what it must exclude in order to constitute itself as abstraction. (…) Abstraction is thus contaminated precisely by the concretion from which it seeks to differentiate itself. Second, the very possibility of illustrating an abstract point by a concrete example presupposes the separation of the abstract and the concrete – indeed, presupposes the production of an epistemic field defined by that binary opposition" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 19).

This is where I, and ultimately Butler, base our oppositions to "formalism". As Butler state in the quote above, drawing from Hegel's discussion on formalism, abstraction and exclusion: no "formal" or "structural" can exist without a trace or remainder of the content it once held. Here is where I position myself in this discussion regarding the Oedipus complex: the positions occupied by "mother" and "father" cannot be merely formal, or filled out by any content, because they carry with it the pre-requisites of "femininity" and "masculinity" in them. Throughout this section, I hope to explore these impossibilities and the traces remaining in the "hollowing" out of those structures.

The reading I've been trying to develop throughout my dissertation, and more specifically throughout this chapter, is one of interrogating the conditions under which psychoanalytical theory understands the emergence of its subject – and we have come to understand this subject's attachment to power –, and, consequently, the exclusions upon which said theory depends on and reproduces in this very process of

understanding. Whether it is Lacan himself – I am honestly still unsure of Lacan's stance in the critique that claims a certain "death of the author" and refuses to take part in a hermeneutics of the intentions behind every word, and, instead, engages with the multiplicity of way in which a text might resonate in every reader – or any formalist/structuralist reading of his psychoanalytical theory, there are political consequences to our claims to knowledge and truth. And, as I have repeatedly stated throughout this dissertation, if we do believe in politically engaged writing, and if we are committed to a horizon of change open for contestation and rooted in the nurturing of difference, we cannot accept such views that take sexual difference as structural or formal elements of subject formation. Here, Butler (2000) opposes herself to Žižek's and other formalists "posit[ing of] a transcultural structure to reality that presupposes a sociality based in fictive and idealized kinship positions that presume the heterosexual family as constituting the defining social bond for all humans" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 141-142), a theory of kinship and sociality which has been shown to have been "artificially constructed by ethnographers hoping to secure a transcultural understanding of heterosexuality and biological reproduction as the points of reference for kinship organization" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 142-143). Her critique here refers to Lacan's use of Levi Strauss anthropological studies on the exchange of women between tribes. This sort of recurrence to a supposed more original, less interfered by elements of culture carry out two colonialist suppositions, that other forms of political organization or social norms are a previous position on where we once stood in the teleology of development; and that culture only emanates and follows european culture, being all other cultures only "cultures", some exotic or backwards manner of behaving.



### 4. 1. 1. Sexual Norm

The cisheteronormative structure through which the exclusion of sexual difference in the Oedipus complex occurs is not only the one I have gone over throughout my previous chapter in my attempt to understand the mechanism of the Name-of-the-Father and its purpose in lacanian subject formation, but also the one

through which the social contract subject emerges in fraternal pact with his brothers. What Pateman once thought as being a patriarchal society, that is, made of fathers, she argues, reveals itself as a community of brothers, which, if we follow Freud's tale, killed the father and now rule in his place. And the institution through which the brothers emerge as equals, as subjects of right, then, is the Sexual Contract. Here I wish to bring an excerpt from Pateman's Sexual Contract, in which she explains the logic of patriarchalism and fraternity.

> "When I first began to think about these questions I mistakenly assumed that the original contract was patriarchal because it was made by fathers. This cannot be the case; the reason that the contract is necessary is because fathers have been stripped of their political power. The participants in the original contract must be capable of creating and exercising political right, which they can no longer do as fathers. Locke's friend, James Tyrrell, wrote of the original contract that women were 'concluded by their Husbands, and [are] commonly unfit for civil business'. But the male participants do not take part in the contract as husbands. Rather, the men who defeat the father, claim their natural liberty and, victorious, make the original contract, are acting as brothers; that is to say, as fraternal kin or the sons of a father, and by contracting together they constitute themselves as a civil fraternity. Fraternity, it has been said, 'is a word to conjure with at all the times and by all fires'. A very nice conjuring trick has been performed so that one kinship term, fraternity, is held to be merely a metaphor for the universal bonds of humankind, for community, solidarity or fellowship, while another kinship term, patriarchy, is held to stand for the rule of fathers which passed away along ago. The modern civil order can then be presented as universal ('fraternal') not patriarchal. Almost no one except some feminists - is willing to admit that fraternity means what it says: the brotherhood of men" (PATEMAN, 1988, p. 77-78).

Pateman draws this conclusion from what she explains as the Sexual Contract: a contract previous to the one Hobbes, Locke or Rousseau suggest in their writings in which women go from being owned by their fathers, to being owned by their husbands. This ownership gives husbands the right to access women's bodies, and, through this access, Pateman argues, they all become father. Establishing their dominance in the household they can, then, meet their fellow men in fraternal equality.

Here we have an instance of cisheteronormativity as the grounds on which society was built, as well as misogyny and patriarchalism. In order for me to be

subjects, they need subjugate women under their rule. And for this process to work out smoothly – as we have seen in The Three Moments of the Oedipus and as we hopefully will be able to see in throughout this chapter – the family structure in which this subduing was performed needed to be a cisheterosexual family, in which "father" and "mother" fell perfectly into their assigned gender roles. So we have, again, cisheteronormativity as the 'glue' holding society together. As the limits of its existence and the last wall standing between men and the wild, or unknown. Here we might go back to the threat of violence, chaos and a gruesome death in social contract, and psychosis in the abject position of the real in lacanian psychoanalysis. Either way, what stands between men and these conditions of abjection is the structure of the heterosexual cisgender biparental bourgeois family.

Here, not only homosexuality, but femininity presents itself as the limits for intelligibility of structure through which the subject emerges. As not having a penis, translated in Lacan's aforementioned "comings and goings" between form and content, structural and real, the woman doesn't undergo castration. As Lacan affirms

> "'la Femme n'existe pas' ('Woman doesn't exist'). This non-existence is described again in the next sentence as "a certain traumatic impossibility", and here it becomes clear that what is traumatic is the non-existence of woman, that is, the fact of her castration. This is "a certain fissure which cannot be symbolized". We might as well ask why the conversation about the castration of woman must stop here. Is this a necessary limit to discourse, or is it imposed in order to ward off a threatening set of consequences? And if one raises a question about this necessary limit, does one inadvertently become the threat of castration itself? For if woman did exist, it seems that, by this logic, she could only exist to castrate". (BUTLER, 1993, p. 203)

Not only does the abject position of the homosexual, but the lack, trauma and impossibility in women seem to pose questions to the limits of symbolization. And here is where I personally feel difficulty in holding a pure structuralist or formalist interpretation of lacanian subject formation, and, at the same time, find it so useful for our diagnosis of political subjecthood. Through Lacan's understanding of femininity and homosexuality, through his approach to these kinds of sexual differences, we can see the lacanian subject – although split, speaking, lacking and all such wonderful

openness through which we might think a more inclusive political project – doesn't differ that much from all the other subjects we've been able to theorize our politics. Yet, we go further questioning the limits of intelligibility of said subject, hoping to find out more not only about its attachments to power or political authority, but to find the limits of its intelligibility.

We have been able to observe Lacan's careful preservation of cisheteronormativity through what I've been dealing with as his "comings and goings' between "structural" and "real' regarding the family in the Oedipus and the penis/phallus, and his conflation of sex, gender and sexuality. What could be interpreted as Lacan's naiveté is also a powerful instrument to secure cisgendering and heterosexuality as the subject's limits of intelligibility. Conflating the "feminine position" with not having the body part we identify as a penis, Lacan not only conflates sex and gender in a naïve way you couldn't possibly expect a french white cisgender heterosexual man in the 1950's not to do, but also secures that morphology takes a biologizing discourse. And here we might start questioning "to what extent within psychoanalysis is the sexed body secured through identificatory practices governed by regulatory schemas?" (BUTLER, 1993, p. 13). That is: what culturally inherent notions of "woman" and "men" does Lacan rely on and reproduces along with a biologizing discourse on bodies? What culturally specific notions of what a "woman" and a "man" are, rooted in the discourse of biology, does Lacan both rely on and reproduce in his theory?

Through a "formalist" or "structuralist" approach to subject formation in the Oedipus, I fear the regulatory schemas become the ways through which morphology, although not being "a prosocial or presymbolic operations, (…) is itself orchestrated through regulatory schemas that produce intelligible morphological possibilities" (BUTLER, 1993, p. 14). Through the recourse to the biologizing discourse of sex, I fear certain "structuralist" lacanisms have been passing their transphobia and heteronormativity unchecked. Those possibilities, in those readings are restricted to the cisheteronormative matrix/narrative in which "men" are equated with "penis", and "women" are equated with a lack thereof, or "vagina". What we are left to ask is to

what extent "can we then read psychoanalysis for the inculcation of the heterosexual matrix at the level of bodily morphogenesis?" (BUTLER, 1993, p. 14), through the aforementioned conflations Lacan so easily moves through.

> "[I]t is hard to know why the 'positions' in this symbolic always revolve around an idealized notion of heterosexual parenting. (…) Lacanians are hard-pressed to justify the recirculation of patriarchal kin positions as the capitalized 'Law'. (…) The fact that my friends Slavoj and Ernesto claim that the term 'Phallus' can be definitionally separated from phallogocentrism constitutes a neologistic accomplishment before which I am in awe. I fear that their statement rhetorically refutes its own propositional content, but I shall say no more" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 153)

Here, it seems difficult to hold a position which would understand "mother" and "father" as mere positions in the structure of the Oedipus complex. Positions which are empty, hollowed out, and could be filled by just about any subject. Lacan, through not only his conflation of sex, sexuality gender, but his reinforcement of gender roles, closes in the possibilities of what could occupy the places of "mother" and "father". In my next subsection I want to explore Lacan's discourse on homosexuality in his January 28th 1958 class on the Logics of Castration. Through his words, we might understand better how he understands satisfactory resolution of the Oedipus complex on relying not only on conservative ideas of gender, sex and sexuality, but as strict ideas of gender roles as well.



### 4. 1. 2. Sexual Difference

This notion of "the heterosexual family as constituting the defining social bond for all humans" is key, here, in my discussion of the lacanian and freudian understanding of subject formation being built upon exclusion of sexual difference. In our world the exclusion of sexual difference can take many forms: bigotry, homophobia, abandonment. But not only these, exclusion of social difference, now more than ever, takes the form of assimilation. Under the banner of "love is love" we are able to push for access to basic rights we've been systematically denied. But under this same banner, the multiplicity of our subversive ways of loving are erased under

the narrative of biparental morally pristine white families. Because what happens when love is not love: when our experiences and understanding of love don't fit the heterosexual pre-conceived narrative of love[28]? We're included as long as "love is love", as long as we're not different, as long as our existence as different doesn't open up the possibility for something else out there, for other narratives not only of love – sexuality and being LGBT not always having to do with love – but of sex, culture, community, and family.

The drag families of the 1980's New York Drag Balls defied the what straight people thought of – and still think of – as family. Drag mothers took in children and created their families and legacies not only out of victories and the titles of legends at the Balls, but in sharing everyday life and passing their experience and advice navigating the world as LGBT people. In those families, people were granted the possibility of existence, and creating affective bonds and experiencing love even when their biological families denied them that, and casted them out into neglect and abandonment (LIVINGSTON et.al, 1992). Club kid icon from the late 1980's and early 1990's James St. James argues against LGBT people "slouching towards respectability", "striving for mediocrity" and "moving towards the middle stream, becom[ing] these bourgeoisie homos" (ST. JAMES, 2014) in his interview with New York Drag Queen Vivacious for his youtube series Transformations as she paints his face. And, as controversial as his figure might be, RuPaul himself has exposed his disbelief in drag culture ever becoming mainstream because of its inherent subversive character. "Drag", RuPaul argues,

> "doesn't conform. It's actually making fun of [conformity]. Now, the talk-show hosts … get it if I'm making fun of myself and if I'm a punch line for them, but not as a human being. They would have a transsexual on because a transsexual is saying, "This is who I really am. I'm real." I'm saying, "No, I'm not real. I'm actually everything and nothing at all." (JUNG, 2016)[29].

[28] Understood as the "relationship escalator", by Franklin Veaux and Eve Rickert: "the assumption that relationships follow a defined course. You meet, fall in love, move in together, share property, have children and grow old together" (2014, p. 42).

[29] Since this interview, in 2016, RuPaul's Drag Race has made its move to VH1 and won 5 Emmy's – which RuPaul, in this same interview says would rather have an enema than an Emmy –, and released

Granting a "quasi-transcendental" status to sexual difference relegates it to a place "outside the struggle for hegemony" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 143), and forecloses the possibilities for sexualities outside the cisheteronormative matrix to have their existence recognized. The point here seems to be precisely about our belonging in the realm of the political, and our chances to advocate for ourselves the autonomy not of the same life as everyone else, but the lives we want to live. But the relegation of sexual difference to a structural place in subject formation through the Oedipus complex relegates it to a place of "(1) non-symbolizable; (2) the occasion for contesting interpretations of what it is; (3) symbolizable in ideal terms, where the ideality of the ideal carries with it the original non-symbolizability of sexual difference itself" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 144). And here is where the disagreement between Butler and Žižek takes the shape – or rather, reveals itself – as being about the limits of intelligibility in lacanian subject formation, and the struggle for a place in the struggle for hegemony in a project for radical democracy.

What Butler, and – dare I say – I are contesting is precisely the narrative I've been examining throughout my dissertation: the emergence of the subject as such through a cisheteronormative biparental structure. What I contest here, through Butler's reading of lacanian subject formation, is sexual difference's ahistorical and asocial position in such structure. What I oppose here, and hope to argue against in this particular section, is the formalist's refusal of "any account given by social construction

songs like the song title his 2017 album American singing "I am American, American / The red, white, and blue / I am American, American / just like you too" (RUPAUL, 2017). So, maybe we take his resistance towards mainstream culture with a grain of salt and, most of all, as an opportunity to exercise Gayatri Spivak's strategic essentialism, and be able to move between the "love is love" narrative, and having our rights recognized, and preserving our culture and safe spaces. As should the positions between, on the one hand, "selling out" and making a profit out of packaging LGBT culture for straight people and gentrification of drag culture; and, on the other hand making the use of an opportunity to get money – which people tend to forget it essential to survive – out of this people's fascination with our culture – which was widely satized in Vanessa Hudgen's comment as a judge on the first episode of the third season of RuPaul's Drag Race All Stars "I'm so into voguing right now". Not only the actress had been made fun of, but the overall comment has been analyzed as "a microcosm of straight ppl commodifying black queer culture for the poor taste of the masses,", in a tweet by executive editor of Hello, Fran Tirado (BERGADO, 2018). But these multiple narratives around LGBT people have only been able to be built from we took place as subjects. RuPaul only got to become controversial, and "cash those checks", as he often refers to when accused of making money out of the gentrification of drag culture, or to further acceptance not only of LGBT people in mainstream media, but self-acceptance of LGBT youth that wouldn't have been able to identify themselves with LGBT culture if it hadn't reached such a wide platform as the one RuPaul has reached.

that might render this [the subject's] fundamental lack as an effect of certain social conditions" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 139-140) and their simultaneous "ground[ings] of any and all sociability" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 140) in sexual difference so as to pose it as a precondition for the subject's access to the symbolic, and, consequently, their psychic, social and political existence. Here, I echo Butler's questions when she writes:

> "Are we using the categories to understand the phenomena, or marshalling the phenomena to shore up the categories 'in the name of the Father', if you will? Similarly, we can try to accept the watered-down notion of the symbolic as separable from normative kinship, but why is there all that talk about the place of the Father and the Phallus?" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 152).

And here is where I think exploring what I think to be one of Lacan's most problematic piece, the third section in his second class on The Three Moments of the Oedipus in the fifth year of his Seminar. In this particular section, he dedicates he tries to explore the Oedipus complex in what regards "homosexuals" in a section of his January 20th 1958 Seminar. By the last third of this day's class, Lacan decides to enquire homosexuality taking a tone of "what could have possibly gone wrong" throughout a subject's formation, more specifically regarding to the resolution of his Oedipus complex, in order for him to become a homosexual. And as cringey and painful as it may be, I think addressing specific passages through which Lacan clearly established homosexuality as the limits of sexual difference are crucial for us to understand the limits of subjecthood and what it as stake in a 'formalist' and a 'historicist' position in this debate.

"[T]he Oedipus complex", Lacan affirms, "has a normative function, not simply in the subject's moral structure nor in his relations with reality, but concerning the assumption of his sex, which as you know, still retains a certain ambiguity in analysis" (LACAN, 2017, p. 149, my emphasis). It's the process through which girls assume their sex as female and boys assume their sex as male – nevermind the logical impossibility of girls and boys knowing which one of either sex they have to "become" before actually becoming it. Throughout this particular section, Lacan conflates notions of sex, gender and sexuality multiples times, butchering concepts and blurring the lines

further down between structural and "real" – as he often refers –, or actual, or even historical – as Žižek accuses Butler. Here I hope not only to point out his homophobia and misogyny, but prepare the ground upon which I can be able to end this chapter posing questions such as the ones Judith Butler does about the presumably hollowed out ahistorical, asocial structure of the Oedipus complex, which nevertheless depends on very historical and social specific delineated sexual differencing. Hence, my stabs at Lacan in this section will not be at random, but, rather, directed at furthering this following point.

Upon enquiring the many things that might have gone wrong in the Oedipus complex resolution, Lacan contemplates many different possibilities in the families' configurations, such as "the father fails to play his role, as they say" (LACAN, 2017, p. 174); "[t]he mother (…) as being more occupied with the child than with the father" or "as been occupied with the child in a very castrating manner" (LACAN, 2017, p. 191); "[c]ases in which the father loves the mother too much, where through his love, he appears too dependent on the mother" (LACAN, 2017, p. 192); in tense relationships "very often marked by all sorts of accusations, complains and manifestations of aggressiveness, as they say" from the mother towards the father, that is; or "[i]n any case, insofar as the father truly shows himself to be in love, he is suspected as not having it" (LACAN, 2017, p. 194). Which seems to boil up to: a family has necessarily to fall strictly into the cisheteronormative nuclear bourgeois mold, in which the mother is emotionally and financially dependent upon the father, which is stern and emotionally distant, spending all his days away, at work. A family in which the separation between private and public is gendered and everything revolves around the father's wants and needs, not only because he is the only being under said roof who can provide for himself, but most importantly, because he is a – financial, social, political and legally – autonomous subject. Whenever that doesn't happen, the child is bound to take a "homosexual position" in relation to his – and his mother's – desire. This, Lacan argues, may happen because

> "[t]he mother who turns out to have laid down the law of the father at a decisive moment. (…) at the time which the prohibiting intervention to the father should have introduced the subject to the

> phase of the dissolution of his relationship to the object of the mother's desire, and cut off at the root of all possibility for him to identify himself with the phallus, the subject discovers, on the contrary, in the structure of the mother, the support and the reinforcement which prevents this crisis from taking place" (LACAN, 2017, p. 192)

And here is where Lacan really seems misinformed about the range of individualities LGBT people can take on. While inquiring about "homosexuals", his only reference seems to be a caricature of a gay man who "adheres to his homosexual position strongly, as his relationships with feminine objects, far from being abolished, are on the contrary profoundly structured" (LACAN, 2017, p. 191), one who has a "a profound and perpetual relationship to the mother" (LACAN, 2017, p. 191), and searches for the phallus that he has once been denied in his partner – as we see in statements such as "The homosexual requirement encountering the perille organ in his partner corresponds precisely to this, which is that in the primitive position" (LACAN, 2017, p. 194). This effeminate, mother-bound boy seems to be the epitome of the "single story" (ADICHIE, 2009) not only about gay men – which seem to be the whole scope of homosexuality covered in his exploration regarding the Name-of-the-Father – but of the LGBT experience as a whole. We "take on our homosexual position" – or, rather, gay man do; because what even is female homosexuality besides a silly play to rouse men? – because our mothers weren't as submissive, or because our fathers weren't as cold and unattached and self-centered as they should have been. Lacan's misogyny really shines through and "the feminine", once again joins "the homosexual" in abjection as seems utterly unable to recognize any strength in femininity when he goes on about homosexual men's fear of vaginas. Lacan seems to bend backwards over and again to argue that the gay boy's "fear of the vagina" isn't really a fear of the vagina itself, but of the "hostile phallus" it has swallowed and not it contains inside of it. "It is the feared vagina insofar as it contains the hostile phallus, the paternal phallus, the phallus that is both fantasmatic and absorbed by the mother, and whose real power she holds in the feminine organ" (LACAN, 2017, p. 195).

Here is where I think we lose something great that could have been. Lacan's questions around homosexuality don't seem to open up a greater and deeper

conversation about the diversity of ways subjects could emerge as such. Quite the contrary, his questions – and here I'm being generous using the term "questions", since he just goes on about the multiple ways in which being born outside a cisheteronormative family could scar someone for life – seem to put homosexuality in the place of an anomalous exotic object to be studied, not a lived experience by people who think and create and are fully able to theorize about our own lives. Lacan doesn't open a conversation regarding "[t]he Oedipus complex (…) normative function (…) concerning the assumption of his sex" (LACAN, 2017, p. 149), but rather, he contributes to the othering of anyone who falls short of this sexual/gender/sexuality norm and goes on to contribute to the pathologization LGBT people. And here Butler's questioning seems poignant as to whether "we [are] using the categories to understand the phenomena, or marshalling the phenomena to shore up the categories 'in the name of the Father'" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 152).

This "marshalling the phenomena to shore up the categories 'in the name of the Father'" is what we understand as the formalist insistence in protecting sexual exclusion as the founding and perpetual condition through which the subject must emerge. And here is where Butler and – again, dare I say – I oppose myself in the exclusion of sexual difference both of the political struggle for hegemony, but of intelligibility altogether. This casting sexual difference into the abjection of the unsymbolisable violently disciplines bodies into the cisheteronormative matrix. This disciplining happens in hospitals through mutilation of intersex children or the injection of hormones in children outside the gender binary, in the streets, where we go through verbal and physical abuse and hundreds of us die, especially transgender folks, and even in those places we call "home", where we fear losing the love and care of our relatives in relationships I am afraid to romanticize, but which nevertheless we might have a certain level of psychic and emotional investment it[30]. "Sexual difference

[30] And here, a passage from Butler's *Psychic Life of Power* comes to mind: "A child's love is prior to judgment and decision; a child tended and nourished in a "good enough" way will love, and only later stand a chance of discriminating among those he or she loves. This is to say, not that the child loves blindly (since from early on there is discernment and "knowingness" of an important kind), but only that if the child is to persist in a psychic and social sense, there must be dependency and the formation of attachment: there is no possibility of not loving, where love is bound up with the requirements for life. The child does not know to what he/she attaches; yet the infant as well as the child must attach in order

functions not merely as ground but as a defining condition that must be instituted and safeguarded against attempts to undermine it (intersexuality, transsexuality, lesbian and gay partnership, to name a few)" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 148).

## 4. 2. Formalisms and Abstractions

Here, the old feminist adage comes to mind: "the personal is political", and how Cynthia Enloe (2014) reads it as a palindrome[31]. This adage comes to mind not only because I find some expression of it every day, but because its form makes me think of another content: the formal is particular. Here, I join in once again Butler (2000) in her reading of Hegel's approach to this debate between formalism and particularism – or "historicism", as we have been reading it. The structural position which formalists argue the Oedipus complex takes, Butler, argues, necessarily carries with something from the particularities from which it emerges. Indeed, Butler questions how certain kinds of formalism are generated by a process of abstraction that is never fully free from the remainder of the content it refuses" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 144-145). And, as we already have been able to observe, a formalist approach to the 'Oedipus complex" or subject formation seems to deny the very remainder of the content it refuses: sexual difference. the Oedipus complex, as I have been reading it, is an approach to subject formation that although leaves us much smarter about the investments, attachments and phantasmatic dimensions of social norms, does so



to persist in and as itself. No subject can emerge without this attachment, formed in dependency, but no subject, in the course of its formation, can ever afford fully to "see" it. This attachment in its primary forms must both come to be and be denied, its coming to be must consist in its partial denial, for the subject to emerge." (BUTLER, 1997, p. 8). As well as one from Nancy Luxon's *Crisis of Authority*: "Intuitively, the experience of authority should be open to the workings of everyday language and moral experience. After all, our first experiences with authority are deeply personal: as children, we become acquainted with the authorities that are parents, bossy old sisters, teachers, doctors, and religious leaders" (LUXON, 2013, p. 32).

[31] Cynthia Enloe, in her 1990 book (revisited in 2014) invites us to understand world politics by asking "Where are women?" in world politics. She bases her inquiry heavily on the feminist adage "the personal is political", which means that our personal lives are embedded on all kinds of political dynamics: the social division of labor of domestic labor performed by third world women in first world countries; the "behind the scenes" unpaid labor of diplomat's wives and the toll they are supposed to take for their husband's careers; the industry of sexual work revolving around military bases around the world…

through the exclusion of a number of "particularities" through which the formal structure can be constituted. The struggle to which I am witness here is the one between heteronormativity and sexual difference. Heteronormativity as the remainder of the sexual particularities upon which the Oedipus complex has been understood, proposed as a procedure through which subject formation is accomplished, and sexual difference as its unspeakable and unsymbolisable limits, that nonetheless insists, and returns.

In this play of identity and difference, cisheterosexuality imposes itself as the norm. And here the notion that cisheterosexuality is a norm is crucial. It means that it is an unachievable ideal that struggles every second of every minute in every instance to keep its place as the norm. From this notion, the possibilities open up. From the notion that heteronormativity is a fragile little thing, paranoid, trying to affirm itself as the norm, as the normal and the mold to which all should fit, rather than an all-encompassing, terrifying monster, about to devour us, opens up a world of possibilities and resistance. We begin to realize that men's efforts to affirm themselves through toxic masculinity is nothing but fear and trauma – of being called a sissy, of being bullied, of being told too many times to "man up" (HOOKS, 2004). And as hard as it is, we can begin to understand where hatred comes from. Not to heal one by one as a hope to save the world. Don't get me wrong. I've hung my white savior coat a while ago, and I absolutely do not believe in individual solutions to collective problems. But rather than psychoanalyzing heteronormativity, men, or masculinity, we can begin to understand them, politically, as trying to viciously assert themselves from a position in which they feel attacked and like they could lose their place of hegemony all the time. I mean, it must be exhausting. We can begin to understand the places from which those homophobic and misogynistic attacks come from, and organize. We can fulfill the radical democratic project of having "difference" as a source of potent contestation and of expansion of perspectives.

Through the process of fixing the norm, the negative in relation to which it affirms itself is relegated to silence, erasure and pathologization.

> "If sexual difference enjoys this quasi-transcendental status, then all the concrete formulations of sexual difference (second-order forms

> of sexual difference) not only implicitly refer back to the more originary formulation but are, in their very expression, constrained by this non-thematizable normative condition. Thus sexual difference in the more originary sense operates as a radically incontestable principle or criterion that establishes intelligibility through foreclosure or, indeed, through pathologization or, indeed, through active political disenfranchisement" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 147).

The abjection to which sexual difference is relegated, as I have tried to argues throughout my dissertation is one that goes beyond the politics or representation – although, as I have said, I do not believe to be irrelevant to be able occupy the place of political subjects, get representation in the proper seats of government and be able to legislate over own bodies – all the way through our very existence and intelligibility as sexually different. When I argue that "love is love" might be harmful to our community is not because I have some pristine idea of how the LGBT community must behave or that we have to stand as the last bastion of resistance. But because if we are only "accepted", if we only get access to rights as long as "love is love", as long as our ways of loving fit the traditional narrative of heteronormativity: biparental monogamous couple, financially stable, home owners… we are not being recognized and accessing those rights for who we are. we are accessing those rights as long as we erase ourselves and fit a narrative which is not ours, and society does not feel threated by us. This means nothing. It might mean for people who are not far from the heterosexual model, for the Neil Patrick Harris's and David Burtka's of the world. But it means nothing to trans-folks who are murdered by the dozens, who are sexually abused and do not have any legal protection, because sex work goes on as not recognized as work. "Those who are dispossessed or remain radically unrepresented by the general will or the universal do not rise to the level of the recognizability human within its terms. The 'human' who is outside that general will is subject to annihilation by it, but this is not an annihilation from which meaning can be derived (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 23)

What I want to keep in mind here is that, in Butler's understanding or norms, the exclusion always presents itself as potent. The exclusion is not annihilated, killed or muzzled. Well, it might be. But it lives on. We were annihilated and massacred by the inquisition, by the AIDS epidemic, by homophobic policies, by improper medical

care, by all efforts to reduce us to nothing. But still, we rise (ANGELOU, 1978). And, as this very negative upon which the norm stands we are able to challenge it, and return, every time.

> "And though the symbolic appears to be a force that cannot be contravened without psychosis, the symbolic ought to be rethought as a series of normativizing injunctions that secure the borders of sex through the threat of psychosis, abjection, psychic unlivability. (…) What would it mean to "cite" the law to produce it differently, to "cite" the law in order to reiterate and coopt its power, to expose the heterosexual matrix and to displace the effect of its necessity?" (BUTLER, 1993, p. 14-15).

This is where I find it impossible for myself to take a so called "formalist" approach into lacanian subject formation. To relegate sexual difference as unspeakable, unsymbolisable, unthematizable, is to forget all the times, when still we rise, is to forget all the discomfort we cause in society and in our own families, at the dinner tables, at the Christmas parties. Is to forget all the cousins and younger friends who have sought in us harbor, and have found in us home – and realize we carry on the Paris Balls drag families' legendary legacies.

We might seem unsymbolisable, but it is in that very place of lack of symbolization – which Lacan nevertheless names: the real – we find our strength. As Real, unsymbolisable difference, we challenge the hegemonic position. And we rely upon the very instability of historical contingencies which might allow us place for contestation.

> "And yet, if hegemony consists in part in challenging the frame to permit intelligible political formations previously foreclosed, and if its futural promise depends precisely on the revisability of that frame, then it makes no sense to safeguard that frame from the realm of the historical. Moreover, if we construe the historical in terms of the contingent and political formations in question, then we restrict the very meaning of the historical to a form of positivism. That the frame of intelligibility has its own historicity requires not only that we rethink the frame as historical, but that we rethink the meaning of history beyond both positivism and theology, and towards a notion of a politically salient and shifting set of epistemes" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 138).

This seems to be the project of radical democracy: harboring contingency, nurturing difference, encouraging contingency and seeking the shift of positions within the political frame, but, more importantly of epistemes – of ways of understanding, languages, intelligibilities – through which we can expand the political and extend universality not to a colonial particular, but as "an open-ended hegemonic struggle" (BUTLER; ŽIŽEK; LACLAU, 2000, p. 38).

And here I would like to close on what I believe to be the very subject of IR as a discipline: "what constitutes the authority of the one who writes those limits, but because the setting of those limits is linked to the contingent regulation of what will and will not qualify as a discursive intelligible way of being" (BUTLER, 1993, p. 190). International Relations Theory, as I have been experiencing it throughout most of my yet short history in the discipline, has been about boundaries, borders and limits. Here in this dissertation, I have tried to engage with what I believe to be one of the most central limit: the one between the subject and the political – which seems to find expression in the discussion around "subjectivity". Subjectivity, as wide and inexact as it might seem, has led me to all this discussion on authorization, attachment, and intelligibility. From here on, my only hope is to continue this conversation.

# CONCLUSION: “I would prefer not to”

Throughout this dissertation, I’ve been avoiding and refusing conclusions. It might be something inherent to my writing: some intentional openness I want to convey, to which jumping to conclusions would be detrimental. It might be an attempt to keep the conversation open, and avoid the monologue-esque structure this kind of academic work leans toward. In my own limited ways, I have been trying to make room for my reader(s) throughout this work. I’ve been trying to spark conversations, rather than hastily jumping to conclusions. But, at last, a work has to be concluded. “I”s dotted and “t”s crossed. And, just as it once began, it has to end. In this conclusion I wish to state my argument clearly – which might not be as easy as one would think; go over the path through which I have been able to reach this argument throughout this dissertation; and point to the work I still want to continue doing regarding the issues raised in this dissertation. I hope to bring this piece of academic work to a closure, opening up the questions that were raised and left unanswered through this piece of work. This is the point of this conclusion.

Ever since I was little, I always wanted to know how stuff works. I used to always ask my parents the meanings of words. And I used to be the annoying kid in class asking teachers “but why?”. As I entered the discipline of “International Relations”, I began to find answers in concepts such as “international system”; “anarchy”; “capabilities”; “balance of power”; “regimes”; “institutions”; “rules”; “norms”; “identities”; and so on. And sure enough, everything made sense. That is the hold theory has on me: it gives me the satisfaction of seeing the little cogs and gears of how the world works. Theory makes the mechanisms and logics underlying world processes seem self-evident. But that is not how the world works. There are no cogs, no gears, no mechanics no blueprints. There are no logics underneath it all. As Foucault once said in his inaugural lecture at the Collége de France in 1970: “We must not imagine the world turns towards us a legible face we would have only to decipher”.

So I began to engage with those more critical strands of theory; the ones that seemed to have more complex answers. But what I found instead, instead of the answers I was looking for, was a deep tension, struggle and entanglement between knowledge and power. What I have been able to craft in this dissertation and what I expect to have been able to share is a narrative of my own struggle with authority, and the power residing claims to know. And my critique of the erasures, silencing and reproduction and crystallization of oppressions these narratives entail.

Throughout my dissertation I believe I have been able to not lose sight of the stuff I – and this institute I have been brought up in – believe constitutes IR: the drawing and contesting of boundaries, borders and limits. The limits of intelligibility of subjects and politics inside and outside those limits, and, specially, at its margins. I have been able to address this issues in my dissertation under the scope of the processes of subject formation and psychic investment in the social contract, such as Freud, Lacan and Hobbes understand them. And, as I wrote this dissertation, I tried to always keep in mind the underlying themes of those struggles between the seduction power entails in claims to know; and the drawing and contesting of boundaries, borders and limits in the context of modern subjecthood.

The first manifestation of the tension between desire, power and claims to know I want to address is the foundational role Hobbes seems to play in International Relations Theory, and in IR as a discipline. As a relatively new discipline, IR relies on a few crutches to hold the claim of a legitimate discipline, Among a few of these crutches at the foundation of our discipline stands Hobbes and, specially, our reading of the hobbesian state of nature.

Anarchy, for most of the IR Theory mainstream literature appears to be more than mere absence of authority. This literature reads anarchy as “[a] condition which is called Warre, and such warre, as is of every man against every men” (HOBBES, 1996, p.). And so states follow suit seeking to secure their survival in a world where anarchy carries the threats of life being “solitary, poore, nasty, brutish and short” (HOBBES, 1996). Hobbes’s authoritative voice seems to ground and guide much of IR Theory in

the mainstream and beyond, as it provides the imaginary not only for the environment states exist in, but the behavior they consequently and necessarily engage in. To engage my desire to know and find the blueprints to the structures of our modern world through Hobbes's authoritative voice, I relied on Charlotte Epstein's (2013) exploration of what she calls the three models of agency in IR Theory, and her argument equating Hobbes's Leviathan to Lacan's Symbolic. The mere possibility that the Leviathan – the socio-political structure Hobbes presents and proposes – and the Symbolic – the socio-linguistic network of intelligibility that holds the very possibility for our psychic existence – is, frankly, nothing short of mind-blowing, for me.

And there is where seduction and desire lay/lie to me – in all the ambiguity "lie" provides – To be granted access and to understand the socio-political-linguistical structure our whole world stands on is basically my dream. To get to understand how the world works, how the wheels turn, and how everything fits together… that is what I've been after. And that is at least half the story of what is involved here in this dissertation.



## 5. 1. Argument

In this dissertation I tried to make one main argument, and had a few orbiting around it, or as foundation for it. In this dissertation I try to a make the argument that our psychic investment is in paternal authority. And I believe it to be so because of the Oedipus complex's intrinsically cisheteronormative and misogynistic character. in order to make this argument, I have drawn from Lacan's and Freud's writings on subject formation and neurosis and in Hobbes's social contract as presented in the Leviathan. I was able to develop my argument in what I believe had been something about four steps, each of them drawing from one another and intertwining. These four supporting arguments are: First, the discipline of IR – as well as modern politics – is founded in an intrinsic distinction between private and public – inside and outside, identity and difference, however you might want to call it –, which psychoanalytical theory understands as a split between conscious and unconscious. Second, the social

contract subject emerges in a deep investment in the structures through which he emerges and the authority/ies in it. Three, this investment follows the structure of the Oedipus complex, in which the figure of the father is central and from it emanates all order in the form of the law. The particular investment the subject has in authority, thus, will be one in paternal authority. And, finally, four, that the Oedipus complex, the myth-like-structure through which first Freud and then Lacan understand subject formation is cisheteronormative and misogynistic.

For the first point, I tried to argue for IR's foundation on the internal fracture of the modern subject between private and public. I did so presenting the foundational narratives to our discipline and the way in which it comes to rely heavily in Hobbes's Leviathan. IR as a discipline seems not only to rely on Hobbes's gruesome state of nature to argue for the intrinsic violence of the state of anarchy in which states find themselves in, but it also seems to share similar starting points with the author. In my first chapter I was able to explore the narrative of Europe's chaos and mayhem around the locus of sovereignty, and explore both IR's disciplinary founding on the Westphalia Treatise, but Hobbes's attempt to reconstruct Europe's political vocabulary from the ground. In this first chapter, I was able to explore the emergence of the modern subject through this new vocabulary which depended very much on a division between being loyal to their sovereign publicly, while keeping whatever opinions and thoughts they might have in private.

For my second argument, I hope to read the emergence of the subject into/through the socio-politico-liguistic fabric that surrounds and forms us in the symbolic/leviathan. I will try to argue for this emergence, which makes the subject a deeply intersubjective being, especially in my first and second chapters. In those chapters, I try to narrate and explore the subject's emergence in the Symbolic and the Social Contract, as Lacan and Hobbes, respectively, understand it. I try to explore this emergence addressing language's structuring role in both hobbesian social contract theory and lacanian psychoanalytical theory. Although the argument that Hobbes and Lacan have completely different approaches can be made, for we can identify a clear nominalism in Hobbes's work, and Lacan has declared himself multiple times as a

strong believer in saussurean linguistic. Although this argument is surely true, here I want to argue for a more basic resemblance between the both of them: language is what structures reality in both authors. Different from authors that draw from multiple different ways of perceiving the world, both Hobbes and Lacan seem to hold language as a structuring principle in both their theories. This manifests in Hobbes's attempt to build a political vocabulary for the world which he encountered falling apart, and in Lacan's emphasis on language through his famous adage "the unconscious is structured like a language", and the mere fact that he sees language as a structure through we must emerge, a realm to which we must have access, in order to become subjects.

For my third argument, I argue that our psychic investments in authority are very much paternal. And, in my fourth argument, I explore how this paternal investment is due to a cisheteronormativity in the structure through which both Freud and Lacan understand subject formation: the Oedipus complex. I try to make these arguments throughout my dissertation in the following ways. On my second chapter, I try to argue for a reading of the social contract subject as a neurotic subject. On my third chapter I explore the device of the Name-of-the-Father, and the structure through which Lacan presents the subject's emergence, with the figure of the father being prominent. And on my fourth chapter I try to both navigate and position myself in the debate between "formalists" and "historicists" regarding this cisheteronormative character of the Oedipus complex.

Having presented the emergence of the subject through language, and the structure of the Oedipus complex, I try to explorer what is at stake in that structure (of the Oedipus complex) more specifically. The Oedipus complex is composed by three parts: "father, "mother" and "child". The child is the subject which will emerge through this structure. The role of the "mother" is to be filled by the child's primary caretaker. If the process is to go smoothly, the "mother" has two tasks. First, is to care for the baby, and direct their attention to it, so as to nurture its narcissism. This is a stage for the child which Freud calls it "his majesty, the baby". Second, to then direct this attention back to the father, making clear he is in fact the object of her desire. The role of the "father", so, will be filled by a stern and distant person, who commands not only

the attention of the entire household, but lays down it law. The father will also have two tasks. First, it will be responsible for the mother's "comings and goings", and the child's perception that it and its mother are not one, and that her desire is located somewhere else. In this stage, the father will not show himself to the child. In this stage, he lays down the law, and the mother is the channel through which it is performed. Then, the father will show himself as the one having "it", and by "it" Lacan means the phallus (φ), by which he means, the mother's desire. Through this strict structure and process, the child, first feel secure and whole in its connection with the mother, then, it feels afraid of the threat of castration the father presents, and then, finally, it feels an identification rooted in love towards the father, as the Oedipus complex comes to a resolution.

What Lacan and his "formalists" seem to miss, nevertheless, is that this structure through which they theorize the subject's emergence is inherently cisterenormative and misogynistic. Through their recurrence to "having it" or "not having it", they, unknowingly reproduce a rather biologizing narrative on sex and gender, and reduce "boys" and "girls" to having or not having a penis to which they could identify with the father, rather that only identifying it in the father[32]. Through the narrative that crystalizes the positions of "mother" and "father" on the Oedipus to one the in force as norm on the format of families in Europe, Vienna, London and Paris, more particularly, between the late 1800's and mid-1900's they reinforce not only heteronormativity, but very strict notions of gender roles. By taking very historical and geographically specific structures of family and notions of sex and gender as universals, abstract, hollowed out structures into which anything could fit, Freud and Lacan perform the violence of excluding – or including by exclusion, as Butler would say, by putting it in a position of abnormal or simply unfit – and marginalizing people who experience life outside this tight and strict mold.

[32] Here I am making reference to the distinction Lacan draws between boys' "identification as it is rooted in love" (LACAN, 2017, p. 154) and girls' not needing "to carry out this identification nor retain this title to virility. She knows where it is, and she knows where she has to get it. It's on the side of the father and she goes to him as having it" (LACAN, 2017, p. 179).

## 5. 2. How far I've come

Writing this dissertation, for me, has been an exercise on resisting and recognizing the lures of authority in the academic world. As well as in writing and thinking politics in our everyday lives and political process – as well as, always, as exercise on breaking with this dichotomy. The investment in authority to which I refer throughout this entire piece of academic work was one through which I found myself most often than not working through in my own relationship to the literature I chose to engage with. My engagement with Hobbes's political theory and Lacan's psychoanalytical theory, I believe, is where this lure and tension shine through most clearly. From Hobbes's disciplinary relevance and centrality to IR Theory, to Lacan's authority over the human psyche, I found myself always facing and holding the tension of engaging authority in my own writing. This dynamic made it easier for me to experience the tensions with authority and the dynamics on coming into being through the relationship(s) with authority on which I was writing. The lures of speaking to one truth were present in every step of the way, from Hobbes's promise to unravel our political dynamics, through Freud and up to Lacan's own delving into the psychic attachment to these dynamics. Everywhere in my writing I faced this dynamics of authority in claims to truth and the lures of the power it produces.

Throughout this dissertation, I feel like I have been able to conjure and open and honest voice. I feel like I could share what is at stake here for me in my own investment in authority, knowledge and my place – or rather, the pursue of a place – in academia. I feel like I have been open about my recourse to Hobbes and the search for legitimacy in a discipline who seems to hold his writings as part of a canon that precedes its founding. I feel like I have been open about Freud and Lacan's lure to "dig deeper", and – hobessianly – unravel the cogs and gears inside each and everyone's minds. I have been able to be open and honest about what is at stake for me in the exclusion, erasure, and marginalization upon which cisheteronormativity stands, and

through which it demarcates the boundaries of the lives worth living and the ones who are not even worth the grief.

This dissertation, more than the presentation of a carefully crafted and polished argument, is the exposition of a process of discovery. It is the work of bodies and minds in the effort of trying to understand. And if I've learned anything with this process – and let me tell you, I have learned a lot – is that the process of understanding follows the same of recognition, in "un méconnaître essentiel au me connaître" (LACAN 2006d, p. 684). So, I keep tumbling, and fumbling and working through theories I barely understand, engaging with authors too hard for me. I keep doing this because what's the fun if I was able to understand everything? What's the joy (or, dare I say, the jouissance)? I keep misunderstanding these authors and theories in order to keep going. In order to have something, instead of everything and nothing at all. In order to keep engaging with enticing, thought provoking and daring ways to understand the world.

And although I could say that each chapter roughly refers to each one of the four supporting arguments that have lead me to my main argument, I also think there is both more and less to them than just parts of a puzzle or building blocks of my brand new toy. Writing each chapter for me was an exercise in learning. I untangled the most chaotic and twisted parts – these were truth specially for Lacan's writings – I worked through particularly difficult parts, I polished and filled up what my dear advisor pointed as lacking or rough. I had relationships with these chapters, and with how much I was able to grow and learn from them. I've kept this dissertation part argumentative – as it should be according to academia's molds – but also partly narrative. Because more than presenting an argument, what I truly wish to do is to take on my reader(s) along with my process of (mis)understanding all these concepts and dynamics. I want them to feel the clicks I had in certain moments, and the rage I poured into certain pages at other moments of my writing. I want them to feel the excitement and the passion with which I have kept throughout this process. Here, I try to bring the main contributions each chapter had not only for supporting my argument(s), but also for my own personal (intellectual) growth.

My first chapter was my first attempt to grapple with Butler's non linearity in subject formation. The way through which I observe Hobbes preparing the grounds and laying out a whole particular subject throughout one fourth of his political treatise, and the in which his social contract comes to rely in this particular conceptualization of subjecthood is one instance in which I could observe this co-dependent, co-constituent relationship between subject and power. In Lacan's psychoanalytical theory, the subject's emergence in the symbolic – which is formed by the language and sociability they have inherited from the generations past – is also a way in which I could see this dynamic in action. In this space I was able to find possible connections between Hobbes's and Lacan's subject. And what has stricken me at first in their approaches to subject formation, as I have already mentioned and explained further, is the way in which language plays a structuring role for both these theorists. The fact that politics cannot operate unless through a shared vocabulary and that the subject doesn't have access to reality unless through the symbolic realm of language and sociability seem to me far greater than any objection over strands of linguistic theory each author follows.

In my second chapter then, I grappled with this particular moment of access to the symbolic realm of language, and the political community constituted in the Leviathan these two authors propose in their works. In this chapter first I tried to follow Freud in his connections between totemic tribes and neurotic subjects, and try to argue for similar connections between the social contract subject and both Freud's neurotic subject and Lacan's split speaking subject. That, as far as I understand, are one and the same. Then, in my second movement on this chapter I tried to understand the moment of emergence in the symbolic and of signature of the social contract as an act of giving up access to "unbound desire" or a "right to all things", respectively. This movement, as I mentioned before, is one of, strangely, giving up everything and nothing at the same time. I say understanding the "pre-symbolic real" Lacan posits as this blissful moment of wholeness with the baby's mother as a pedagogical tool for understanding the subject's access to the symbolic. Here, I position myself with Bruce Fink (1996) when he argues that since even before a child is born, their place in the symbolic fabric has already been carved out. Before a child is even born, they might already have a name, they definitely have a place in the social constellation of their family, their

mothers and fathers might already talk to them even when they're inside their mom's uterus. There are many ways in which a child is already sewn into the symbolic even before it can experience this moment of bliss and wholeness. There is always a symbolic, an imaginary and a real working their ways through the child's unconscious.

In my third chapter, then, I attempt to take a step further into lacanian subject formation, trying to understand the device of the Name-of-the-Father, and put forward my speculations about our investments in paternal authority. Here I try to carefully reconstruct The Three Moments of the Oedipus, from Lacan's fifth Seminar, on Formations of the Unconscious. There three moments are. First, the aforementioned moment of bliss and wholeness the child hypothetically experiences with their mother, a moment in which Freud calls the child "his majesty, the baby". Second, a moment in which the baby might have gained a certain autonomy and doesn't need the mother's attention absolutely at all times. This is a moment when the child begins to speculate about the mother's "comings and goings". A moment in which they wish they were responsible for her "comings and goings", for her desire. But which they found to be something else. In this moment, too, the father appears as the law. He doesn't physically, actually appear, but his law does, by intermediate of the mother. This is a moment in which the child fears the law of the father and his power, and fears castration. The third and final moment of the Oedipus complex, its resolution, comes with the father revealing himself as the one who "has it", "it" being the phallus (φ), the desire of the mother. In this moment the child – if it's a boy – forms an identification of the child with the father, and is not castrated, but rather, gets to "have his penis for later". As the girl only identifies the father as "having it", and knows where to find "it". In this third chapter I have tried to argue for our investment in authority as investment in paternal authority for the centrality the father figure takes in the Oedipus complex, and also the relationship of both fear and "identification as it is rooted in love" (LACAN, 2017, p. 154).

In my fourth and final chapter, I try to follow and join in Judith Butler's argument in the "formalists" versus "historicists" debate. This is a debate between those who believe that lacanian understanding of subject formation happens through

an abstract, “hollowed out” structure, in which any given person can occupy any given position at any given time. These, as one might have imagined, are the “formalists”. And those who believe that there is no such thing as an “abstract”, “formal” or “hollowed out” structure. Butler in particular engages with Hegel’s work on the production of abstraction from particularism through exclusion. She, as well other fellow “historicists” argue that there’s always a remainder, a trace of the particular left on the formal, structural or abstract. Here, in this case, I argue that Freud and Lacan’s understanding of subject formation through the Oedipus complex carries with it remainders or traces of cisheteronormativity and misogyny. That only very particular subjects, as I explore in Lacan’s section on homosexuality in his January 28th 1958, can fit the molds through which the Oedipal drama takes place is a very restrictive understanding of what gets to be considered normal, and what is relegated to the margins. Through the exploration of these particularities – transphobic, homophobic and misogynistic particularities – in the structure through which Lacan understands subject formation, I hope to contribute to my argument to our attachment in paternal authority. That it is actually not the fact that anyone can occupy any position in this structure, leaves the father – the masculine, penis possessing, breadwinner, male figure of the father – as the perpetual place of the law.



## 5. 3. “… or Worse”

And then we have all that could have been. And all that hopefully will be. I had a limited amount of time, and I also had to write something that was the least bit coherent, instead of just arguments on top of arguments, on top of readings and on and on. So I had to make decisions on what I would keep and what I would leave out of my dissertation. And now that you have read everything I have been able to make this dissertation into, I get to share everything else I wish I had explored. All the literatures and debates. And everything I wish to pursue from now on. And here in this conclusion I want to highlight three bodies of literature I wish to engage in my path further, and these are: Lacan’s later seminars, as he supposedly explores more the themes of divine

authority; the already mentioned, and much larger group of psychoanalysts dealing with the issues of race and coloniality; and, finally, the debates on radical democracy, the struggles for hegemony and the need for contestation in this project.

Lacan's later seminars and the possibility to deal with issues of a theological order in the world in which we might still be invested in, and the relations he supposedly draws between "the one" and the subject are what interest me the most about this particular body of literature. Of course, I hope to continue reading on lacanian psychoanalytical theory, and find myself either agreeing with the formalist claims, or reifying my position with historicists – or find myself somewhere in between. I hope to understand better the dynamics between the symbolic, the imaginary and the real, as well as these "feminine" and "masculine" positions on his psychoanalytical theory.

The group of authors dealing with race and coloniality in psychoanalytical and political theory is a far larger piece of literature that I might ever hope to exhaust. Between Ashis Nandy, Franz Fanon, Lélia Gonzalez, Neuza Santos Souza and many many others, I hope to gain some knowledge in a process which I do not experience in my own skin, and can only hope to seek educate myself about. These perspectives are ones which I had hoped to engage with as I engaged with issues of sex, sexuality and gender in my dissertation. But, as I have already mentioned, I didn't and don't think I could do this literature justice, and I could not possibly do them justice. As I have already mentioned in my previous chapter, the debates around race and coloniality in psychoanalytical theory seem to me as a silence and erasing, differently than the issues around sex, sexuality and gender who seem to scream at top of their lungs: PROBLEMATIC. Sex, sexuality and gender seem to be a recurrent theme on psychoanalytical theory. And although I intuitively might know that race and coloniality might be just as present, I was not able to hone in those sensibilities in time for this work, nor read up on all the literature I would have had to.

And, finally, the debate around "radical democracy". Well, first of all, to be honest, I wish I could "catch up" and acquire knowledge on our whole political

thinking. Since Aristotle and Plato to the most recent thinkers. As I mentioned before, Hobbes as a way for me to address something that seemed to me foundational: not only to the discipline of IR, but to modern politics more broadly. And the discussion around radical democracy is what seems to be sparking, for quite some time, the discussions around the left's political projects. The fight for hegemony is one I definitely feel in Bolsonaro's Brasil, and room for contestation is all I could hope for in the basis of a political project.

"International Politics", I have learned, is the practice of drawing and contesting boundaries borders and limits. And that is what it at stake in Hobbes's writings, as much as in Lacan's. Who gets to be a subject? Who is granted this political status? And, specially, under what erasures the category of subject stand? What exclusions does the process of subject formation these authors narrate entail?

Throughout my entire dissertation I kept in mind Judith Butler's (1999) discussion of Foucault's process of subject formation. She takes on from Foucault, and adds on what she calls a "psychoanalytical step", the logic in which subject and power only exist in relation to one another. There is no subject without the power under which it emerges as such, and that there is no power except the one subjects exert or have thrust upon them. We then get a symbiotic relationship in which subject and power depend on each other to exist. Which opens up a world of possibilities for me to understand our world, and the logics it operates in. If subjects emerge as such only through a primary dependence on the law of the father and if power exists and depends on particular models of subjects – and here I keep in mind the aforementioned careful construction relies on the Leviathan – our dependence and psychic investment in paternal authority seems evident.

But "[W]e must not imagine that the world turns towards us a legible face which we would have only to decipher" (FOCAULT, 1981, p. 67).

I thought I had the keys, I thought I had the answers. And I so desperately wanted to have them, the keys and the answers, the blueprints and the understanding of how the whole structure works. And I let myself get lost and be seduced by Hobbes,

by Lacan, by Freud… By whatever snake might have dangled an apple in front of me and said: go ahead, bite, then, you'll finally understand. But that's not how the world works. That's not how this dissertation works. This dissertation has not been an argument or an explanation of how the process of investments in paternal authority occurs. This dissertation has been a narrative of my desire to know. The seduction people who claim to have the answers exert over me. And, finally, my positioning of an understanding of politics not as mechanic process, and Hobbes might have suggested in another of his works: De Cive; but of a process of exclusion and inclusion, of a constant drawing and contesting of boundaries, borders and limits. The one which I find it to be the most luring and seductive: the category of the subject.

What I have learned throughout this dissertation is not a mechanic process through which subjects are mass produced. What I learned are the exclusions upon which subjects are formed. Again: who gets to be a subject? Who has access to this political category? And what gets left out as its constitutive outside. And I have learned and perceived it to be sexual difference. Now this is the most important part for me. This is where I think my particular struggle with my desire to know and my suspicion of clear cut narratives shows

A project for radical democracy, we've been able to get a glimpse, depends on its openness for contestation, for the possibility that groups that at some point have not able to show political significance or weight, might rearticulate and return and offer resistance and contest the hegemonic stablished groups in power. This seems like a fairly good plan until we realize exclusion from hegemony or universality, in lacanian terms, means annihilation, means non-existence, means existing beyond symbolization, means existing beyond our limits of intelligibility of what existence can possibly encompass.

Now, Butler brings our attention not only to these logics, but most importantly, to how this exclusion, in lacanian psychoanalytical theory, is fundamentally based on the exclusion of sexual difference. As I have mentioned before, the three moments of the Oedipus complex, which Lacan holds dear as the necessary process through which

a subject must undergo to emerge as such is heavily reliant on cisnormativity, heterosexuality and a dash of misogyny. And here I choose to focus on the heavily normative character of the Oedipus complex, which must follow precisely the three steps Lacan delineates, and Lacan's conflation of sex, gender and sexuality, along with his reification of traditional roles of feminine and masculine. And here I cannot begin to describe the harms this crystallization of an extremely geographically and historically specific model of family and the gender roles each member must play in it does.

First of all, as Butler mentions, it might have the very practical effects of denying LGBT families rights such as parenthood, claiming that their families are not fit for the proper upbringing of a "normal" child. But, more broadly, it casts LGBT people, and here I mean LBGT: lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transsexual people, into the realm of the unintelligible. It denies us, as a group the possibility for contestation. It strips us away of our humanity, and it casts us away permanently in the position of "otherness" and "abjection". So, we are able to exist. But only insofar as "love is love", as our forms of love fit the cisgender heterosexual patriarchal concept of "love". We get to exist, if we change, if we conform, if we present a cleaner, sanitized version of ourselves.

And this is what I want to understand here: the place for "sexual difference" in a political project which seems to hold "sexual difference" as "quasi-transcendental", formal or abstract. The debate between "historicism" and "formalism" in lacanian psychoanalytical theory might be interpreted and a far up the ivory tower debate, as "how many angels can dance on the head of a pin?" or something like this. But to those who live the crystallization of this othering daily, theory comes alive. Disciplining our bodies, denying our existence, and making policies everyday based on this very "other" and "abject" position we occupy.

And it's along those lines I hope to have been able to start the conversation in this dissertation: along the lines of the processes of inclusion and exclusion; and the

drawing and contesting of boundaries, borders and limits an ahistorical and asocial understanding of subject formation and sexual difference might entail.

## References


ADICHIE, Chimamanda. The danger of a single story. *TED*: Ideas worth spreading. 23 jul. 2009. Disponível em <https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story> Acesso em 18 jun. 2019.

ANGELOU, Maya. *And Still I Rise*. London: Little Brown Book Group, 1978.

ASHLEY, Richard K. Living on Border Lines: Man, Postructuralism and War. In: DER DERIAN, James; SHAPIRO, Michael J. *International/Intertextual Relations*: Postmodern Readings of World Politics. New York: Lexington Books, 1989.

BARTELSON, Jens. *Genealogy of Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

_____. Second Natures: Is the State Identical with Itself?. *European Journal of International Relations*. vol. 4, n. 3, p. 295-326, 1998.

BERGADO, Gabe. "RuPaul's Drag Race" Fans Call Out Vanessa Hudgens's Line About Voguing. *Teen Vogue*. 26 jan. 2018. Disponível em: <https://www.teenvogue.com/story/rupauls-drag-race-vanessa-hudgens-voguing>. Acesso 29 jun. 2019.

BOLTANSKI, Luc. *Distant Suffering*: Morality, Media and Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

BRIGG, Morgan; BLEIKER, Roland. Autoethnographic International Relations: exploring the self as a source of knowledge. *Review of International Studies*. v. 36, n. 1, p. 779-798, 2010.

BUTLER, Judith. *Bodies that Matter*: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex". New York, London: Routledge, 1993.

_____. *The Psych Life of Power*: Theories in Subjection. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

_____. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

_____; LACLAU, Ernesto; ŽIŽEK, Slavoj. *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality*: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left. London: Verso, 2000.

CAMPBELL, David. *Writing Security*: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.

CORRÊA, Mariza. Sobre a invenção da mulata. *Cadernos Pagu*, n. 6/7, 1996.

DALEY, Kate M. Fear and Honesty: On Reconciling Theory and Voice, in Two Parts. *Disorder of Things*. 13 mar 2013. Disponível em: <https://thedisorderofthings.com/2013/03/13/fear-and-honesty-on-reconciling-theory-and-voice-in-two-parts/>. Acesso em 16 mar 2019.

DAUPHINEE, Elizabeth. *The Politics of Exile*. Oxon: Routledge: 2013.

DE CARVALHO, Benjamin; LEIRA, Halvard; HOBSON, John M. The Big Bangs of IR: The Myths That Your Teachers Still Tell You about 1648 and 1919. *Millennium*: Journal of International Studies, vol. 39 n. 3, p. 735–758, 2011.

DUNKER, Christian Ingo Lenz. Estrutura e personalidade na neurose: da metapsicologia do sintoma à narrativa do sofrimento. *Psicologia USP*. v. 25, n. 1, p. 77-96, 2014.

EDKINS, Jenny. *Postructuralism & International Relations*: Bringing the Political Back In. Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999.

ENLOE, Cynthia. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases*: Making Feminist Sense of the World. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

_____. Margins, Silences, and Bottom Rungs: How to Overcome the Underestimation of Power in the Study of International Relations. In: ZALEWSKI, Marysia; BOOTH, Ken; SMITH, Steve. *International Theory*: Positivism and Beyond, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

_____. *The Curious Feminist*: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2004.

EPSTEIN, Charlotte. Theorizing Agency in Hobbes's Wake: The Rational Actor, the Self, or the Speaking Subject. *International Organization*. v. 67, n. 2, p287-316, 2013.

EVANS, Dylan. *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

FANON, Franz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Groove Press, 1967.

FINK, Bruce. *The Lacanian Subject*: Between Language and Jouissance. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1996.

FOUCAULT. Michel. *Society Must Be Defended*: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76. New York: Picador, 2003.

_____. *The History of Sexuality, Volume I*: An Introduction. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

_____. *The Order of Discourse*: Inaugural Lecture at the Collège de France, given in 2 December 1970. In: YOUNG, Robert. Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

FREUD, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Mansfield Centre: Martino Publishing, 2016.

_____. Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. _____. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XVIII (1920-1922)*:

Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and Other Works. London: Vintage Classics, 2001.

_____. *Moses and Monotheism*. London: Vintage Books, 1939.

_____. Neurose e Psicose. In: _____. *O Eu e o Id, "Autobiografia" e Outros Textos (1923-1925)*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2011.

_____. *Totem and Taboo*: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics. London: Routledge, 2001.

GILPIN. Robert. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

GONZALEZ, Lélia; HASENBALG, Carlos. *Lugar de Negro*. Rio de Janeiro: Marco Zero, 1982,

HERZ, John H. Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. *World Politics*, v. 2, n. 2, p. 157-180, 1950.

HOBBES. *De Cive*: Philosophical Rudiments Concerning Governments and Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

_____. Thomas. *Leviathan*: New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.

HOOKS, Bell. *The Will to Change*: Men, Masculinity, and Love. New York: Washington Square Press, 2004.

INNAYATULLAH, Naeem. Falling and Flying. In: _____. *Autobiographical International Relations*: I, IR. Oxon: Routledge, 2010.

_____. Why do some people think they know what's best for others?. In: ZEHFUSS, Maya; EDKINS, Jenny. *Global Politics*: A New Introduction. Oxon: Routledge, 2014.

JERVIS, Robert. Cooperation under the Security Dilemma. *World Politics*, v. 30, n. 2, p. 167-214, 1978.

JUNG, Alex E. Real Talk With RuPaul. *Vulture*. mar. 2014. Disponível em: <https://www.vulture.com/2016/03/rupaul-drag-race-interview.html>. Acesso em 28 jun. 2019.

KAHN, Victoria. *Wayward Contracts*: The Crisis of Political Obligation in England 1640-1674. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004.

KATZENSTEIN, Peter. *The Culture of National Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

KINDLEBERGER, Charles P. International Public Goods without International Government. *The American Economic Review*, v. 76, n. 1, p. 1-13, 1986.

KORAB-KARPOWICZ, W. Julian, Political Realism in International Relations. In: ZALTA, Edward N. (ed). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2018. Acesso em 24 out. 2018. Disponível em: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/realism-intl-relations/>.

KOSELLECK, Reinhart. *Critique and Crisis*: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1988.

KRAMNICK, Isaac. Equal opportunity and 'the race for life'. *Dissent*, New York, v. 28, p. 181-187, 1981.

KRASNER, Stephen D. State power and the Structure of International Trade. *World Politics*, v. 28, n. 3, p. 317-347, 1976.

KUMARAKULASINGAM, Narendran. Bloody Translations: The Politics of International Compassion and Horror. *Journal of Narrative Politics*, York, v. 1, n. 1, Set. 2014.

LACAN, Jacques. *Formations of the Unconscious*: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book V. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2017.

_____. *Introduction to the Names-of-the-Father Seminar*. October. v. 40, p. 81;95, 1987.

_____. The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis. In: _____. *Écrits*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2006a.

_____. The Instance of the Letter in the Unconscious or Reason Since Freud. In: _____. *Écrits*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2006b.

_____. The Subversion of the Subject and the Dialectic of Desire. In: _____. *Écrits*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2006c.

_____. The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function. In: _____. *Écrits*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2006d.

LACLAU, Ernesto; MOUFFE, Chantal. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics. London, New York: Verso, 2001.

LAPLANCHE, Jean; PONTALIS, Jean-Bertrand Lefebvre. *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*: Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1973.

LIVINGSTON, Jennie; LABEIJA, Pepper; PENDAVIS, Kim; PENDAVIS, Freddie; COREY, Dorian; XTRAVAGANZA, Venus; NINJA, Willi; ST. LAURENT, Octavia. *Paris is burning*. United States: Fox Lorber Home Video, 1992.

LOPES, Moisés Alessandro Souza. A ‘intoxicação sexual’ do novo mundo: Sexualidade e permissividade no livro Casa-Grande e Senzala. *Revista Mediações*, v.8, n. 2, p. 171-189, 2003.

LUXON, Nancy. *Crisis of Authority*: Politics, Trust, and Truth-Telling in Freud and Foucault. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

MAMDANI, Mahmood. Making Sense of Political Violence in Postcolonial Africa, *Identity, Culture and Politics*, v. 3, n. 2, Dez. 2002.

MARTELL, James. *Subverting the Leviathan*: Reading Thomas Hobbes as a Radical Democrat. New York, Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press, 2007.

MEARSHEIMER, John. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W. W. Nanon & Company, 2001.

MILLS, Charles W. *The Racial Contract*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1997.

MIRANDA, Marina Sertã; CHAMON, Paulo Henrique de Oliveira. The Psychic Life of Neoliberalism: Subject Formation and Psychic Suffering in a Culture of Competition. *Anais do 6º Encontro da ABRI*, realizada na PUC-MG em jul. 2017. Disponível em: < http://www.encontro2017.abri.org.br/resources/anais/8/1503500960_ARQUIVO_Miranda;Chamon-ThePsychicLifeofNeoliberalism.pdf>. Acesso 23 fev. 2019.

MOHANTY, Chandra Talpade. Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses. *boundary 2,* v. 12, n. 3, p. 333-358, 1984.

MORGENTHAU, Hans. *Scientific man versus power politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

MUPPIDI, Himadeep. *Colonial Signs of International Relations*. London: C. Hurst & Co Publishers, 2012.

MURPHY, Ryan. Theatricality. In: _____. *Glee*. US: Fox Broadcasting Company, 2010.

NANDY, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy*: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983.

ONUF, Nicholas. *World of our Making*: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.

PACHECO, Ana Claudia Lemos. *Branca para Casar, Mulata para F...., Negra para Trabalhar*: Escolhas Afetivas e Significados de Solidão entre Mulheres Negras em Salvador, Bahia. Campinas: Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 2008.

PATEMAN, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.

RUBIN, Gayle. The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex. In: _____. *Deviations*: A Gayle Rubin Reader. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2011.

RUPAUL. *American*. Los Angeles, RuCo Inc, 2017. Disponível em: <https://open.spotify.com/album/3WX0a9UW0ss5IOp9hSP4F2?autoplay=true&v=L >. Acesso em 28 jun. 2019.

QUIJANO, Anibal. Colonialidade do poder, Eurocentrismo e América Latina. In: LANDER, Edgardo (org). *A colonialidade do saber*: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais. Perspectivas latino-americanas. Buenos Aires: CLACSO, Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales, 2005.

SAFATLE, Vladimir. *O Circuito dos Afetos*: Corpos Políticos, Desamparo e o Fim do Indivíduo. 2nd. ed. rev. São Paulo: Autêntica, 2016.

SANTOS SOUZA, Neuza. *Tornar-se Negro*: As Vicissitudes da Identidade do Negro Brasileiro em Ascenção Social. Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal, 1990.

SOLOMON, Ty. *The Politics of Subjectivity in American Foreign Policy Discourses*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015.

ST. JAMES, James. James St. James and Vivacious: Transformations. *WOWPresents*. 18 mar. 2014. Disponível em: <https://youtu.be/exbKiOmizI4>. Acesso em 28 jun. 2019.

STOLKE, Verena. O enigma das interseções: classe "raça", sexo, sexualidade. A formação dos impérios transatlânticos do século XVI ao XIX. *Estudos Feministas*. Florianópolis, vol. 14, n. 1, p. 15-42, 2006.

STRAVRAKAKIS. Yannis. *Lacan and the Political*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

SNYDER, Richard C., BRUCK, H.W., SAPIN, Burton. *Foreign Policy Decision-Making (Revisited)*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002.

TICKNER, J. Ann. You Just Don't Understand: Trouble Engagement Between Feminists and IR Theorists. *International Studies Quarterly*. v. 41, p. 611-632, 1997.

TILLY, Charles. War Making and State Making as Organized Crime. In: EVANS, Peter et al. *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

TODOROV, Tzvetan. *A Conquista da América*: A Questão do Outro. São Paulo: WMF Martins Fontes, 2010.

THUCYDIDES. The Melian Dialogue. In: P. Viotti and M. Kauppi. *International Relations Theory*. Boston: Allyn and Beacon, 1997.

UNFE: United Nations Free and Equal. *Intersex Factsheet*. Out 2018. Disponível em: <https://www.unfe.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Intersex-English.pdf>. Acesso 25 de jun de 2019.

VEAX, Franklin; RICKERT, Eve. *More Than Two*: A Practical Guide to Ethical Polyamory. Oregon, British Columbia: Thorntree Press, 2014.

VINCENT, John. The Hobbesian Tradition in Twentieth Century International Thought. *Millenium*: Journal of International Studies. v. 10, n. 2, p.91-101, 1981.

WALKER, R. B. J. *After the Globe, Before the World*. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

_____. Hobbes, origins, limits (2011). In: _____. *Out of Line*: Essays on the politics of boundaries and the limits of modern politics. London and New York: Routledge, 2016.

_____. *Inside/Outside*: International Relations as Political Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

_____. *Lines of Insecurity*: International, Imperial, Exceptional. Security Dialogue. v. 37, n. 1, p. 65-82, 2006.

_____; BIGO, Didier. Political Sociology and the Problem of the International. *Millennium*: Journal of International Studies. v. 35, n. 3, p.725-739, 2007.

WALTZ, Kenneth. *Man, the State and War*: A Theoretical Analysis. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

_____. *Theory of International Politics*. Boston: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1979.

WEBER, Cynthia. *Simulating Sovereignty*: Intervention, the State and Symbolic Exchange. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

WEBER, Max. *The Vocation Lectures*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2004.

WENDT, Alexander. Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. *International Organization*. v. 46, n. 2, p. 391-425, 1992.

WILLIAMS, Michael C. Hobbes and International Relations: A Reconsideration. *International Organization*, v. 50, n. 2, pp. 213-236, 1996.

ZALEWSKI, Marysia. All these theories and the bodies keep piling up: theories, theorists, theorizing. In: BOOTH, Ken; ZALEWSKI, Marysia; SMITH, Steve. *International Theory*: Positivism and Beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

ZEHFUSS, Maja. Conclusion: What can we do to change the world?. In: _____; EDKINS, Jenny. *Global Politics*: A New Introduction. Oxon: Routledge, 2014.